

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

KEMP MALONE

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

HAZELTON SPENCER

C. S. SINGLETON

VOLUME LII

1937

BALTIMORE

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

1937

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME LII

	PAGE
Buhler, Curt F., A New Lydgate-Chaucer Manuscript	1
Tuve, Rosemond, Spring in Chaucer and Before Him	9
Dempster, Germaine, Chaucer at Work on the Complaint in the <i>Franklin's Tale</i>	16
Ross, Woodburn O., A B Version of the Legend Told by Chaucer's Prioress	23
Coffman, George R., Old Age in Chaucer's Day	25
Hench, A. L., On the Subtly Creeping Wine of Chaucer's Pardoner	27
Brown, Beatrice D., A Thirteenth-Century Chaucerian Analogue	28
Whitford, H. C., An Uncollected Sixteenth-Century Allusion to <i>The House of Fame</i>	31
Biaddy, Haldeen, Sir Lewis Clifford's French Mission of 1391	33
Herben, S. J., Jr., A Note on the Helm in <i>Beowulf</i>	34
Savage, Henry L., <i>Brow</i> or <i>Brawn</i> ?	36
Moore, Olin H., Bandello and "Clizia"	38
Baudin, Maurice, The Conquerer in Seventeenth-Century French Drama	45
Spitzer, Leo, Un Passage de Lope de Vega, l'espagnol <i>segullo</i> et l'étymologie du français <i>talus</i> .	79
Painter, Sidney, The Historical Setting of <i>Robert veez de Perron</i>	83
Vignerat, L.-A., Notes sur <i>Guillaume de Dole</i> .	87
Krakeur, L. G., A Forgotten Participant in the Attack on the Con- vent Madame de Genlis.	89
Allen, Harold B., Shakespeare's "Lay Her A-Hold"	96
Mills, L. J., A Note on <i>I Tamburlane</i> , I, ii, 242-43	101
Kuehn, G. W., Thomas Deloney: Two Notes	103
Allen, D. C., The Relation of Drayton's "Noah's Flood" to the Ordinary Learning of the Early Seventeenth Century	106
Legouis, Pierre, Dryden and Eton	111
Bennett, J. A. W., Dryden and All Souls	115
Alspach, R. K., The Matchless Orinda.	116
Arndt, K. J. R., New Letters from James Fenimore Cooper	117
Ebeling, Herman L., The Word <i>Anachronism</i>	120
Koller, Kathrine, A Source for Portions of <i>The Witch of Atlas</i>	157
Pfeiler, W. K., Coleridge and Schelling's Treatise on the Samothracian Deities	162
Wilcox, S. C., The Source of Wordsworth's "The Force of Prayer".	165
Roche, Alphonse V., Le Mot "Traditionalisme"	167
Thompson, J. W., On the Date of the <i>Lancelot</i>	172
Bühler, C. F., A Satirical Proclamation	172
Gottfried, Rudolf, The Date of Spenser's "View"	176
Chester, A. G., Notes on the Bibliography of Thomas Churchyard	180
Bowers, F. T., Gascoigne and the Oxford Cipher	183

	PAGE
Camp, T. W., Another Version of "The Things That Cause a Quiet Lyfe"	186
Chang, Y. Z., Sangley, the Merchant-Traveller	189
Gilbert, A. H., Chapman's Fortune with Winged Hands	190
Bowers, F. T., The Date of <i>Revenge for Honour</i>	192
Eidson J. O., Senecan Elements in Maiston's <i>Antomo and Mellida</i>	196
Eidson, J. O., A Marston Note	198
Noyes, R. G., A Manuscript Restoration Prologue for <i>Volpone</i>	198
Thompson, J. W., A Note on <i>The Tempest</i>	200
Yamagiwa, J. K., A Shakespeare Allusion	201
Miller, F. S., Notes on Some Eighteenth-Century Dramas	203
Schulze, I. L., An Inconsistency in the Thought of Goldsmith	206
Sturtevant, A. M., Gothic Notes	207
Boys, R. C., An Eighteenth-Century Essay on Spelling	209
Kueth, J. L., <i>Pocosin</i>	210
Françon, Marcel, La Pratique et la Théorie du <i>rondcau</i> et du <i>rondel</i> chez Théodore de Banville	235
Brown, Donald F., Two Naturalistic Versions of Genesis Zola and Pardo Bazán	243
Arjona, J. H., La Fecha de <i>Ejemplo de casadas y prueba de la paciencia</i> de Lope de Vega	249
Iacuzzi, A., The Naive Theme in <i>The Tempest</i> as a Link between Thomas Shadwell and Ramón de la Cruz	252
Norman, H. L., A Possible Source for E. A. Butti's <i>Castello del sogno</i>	256
Steiner, A., St. Jerome and the First Terzina of the <i>Divine Comedy</i>	259
Ham, E. B., Passages from the Anglo-Norman Book of Kings.	260
Loss, H., <i>Espreu</i> in <i>Le Jeu de la Feuille</i>	262
Holmes, U. T., Provençal, <i>huelh de veure</i> and <i>sec son agre</i>	264
Pitou, Spire, Jr., French and English Echoes of a Descriptive Passage in Tasso	265
Pike, Robert E., Note on a Letter by Fontenelle	266
Von der Muhll, E., Une Source du <i>Zadig</i> de Voltaire.	268
Henning, Geo. N., Vigny's "Élévations"	269
Hughes, A. H., A Fragment of a Drama by Herman Grimm	313
Jantz, H. S., The Factor of Generation in German Literary History	324
Wolf, H. M., Der Bruch in Kleists <i>Penthesilea</i>	330
Blankenagel, J. C., <i>Prinz Friedrich von Homburg</i> and Freedom of Initiative	339
Thalman, Marianne, Jean Pauls Schulmeister	341
Young, Karl, Chaucer and Aulus Gellius	347
Boys, R. C., An Unusual Meaning of "Make" in Chaucer	351
Ericson, E. E., "Reaving the Dead" in the Age of Chivalry	353
Galinsky, H. K., Is Thomas De Quincey the Author of <i>The Love-Charm</i> ?	389
Tilley, M. P., "Twill Be Thine Another Day"	394
Strathmann, E. A., <i>Lycidas</i> and the Translation or "May".	398

CONTENTS

v

	PAGE
Bennett, Josephine Waters, Did Spenser Starve?	400
Williams, F. B., Jr., Notes on <i>Englands Parnassus</i>	402
Evans, G. B., Note on Fletcher and Massinger's <i>Little French Lawyer</i>	406
Bush, Douglas, <i>Julius Caesar</i> and Elyot's <i>Governour</i>	407
Stroup, Thomas B., Scenery for <i>The Indian Queen</i>	408
Diekhoff, John S., "The Milder Shades of Purgatory"	409
Sensabaugh, G. F., An Answer to Suckling's "Why So Pale and Wan, Fond Lover?"	410
Holsapple, Cortell, Some Early Verses by Chesterfield	411
McBryde, John M., A Curious Blunder in Some Modern English Trans- lations of King Alfred's Version of Bede's History	412
Loomis, Roger Sherman, Gawain in the <i>Squire's Tale</i>	413
Whiting, B. J., The Miller's Head	417
Fess, G. M., A New Source for Balzac's <i>Contes diaboliques</i>	419
Austin, H. D., "Letargo" (<i>Par</i> , XXXIII, 94)	469
Baudin, M., The People in Seventeenth-Century French Tragedy	475
Beall, C. B., Deux Romans peu connus du XVII ^e siècle français	482
Schinz, A., D'où sort <i>l'Après-midi d'un faune</i> de Mallarmé?	485
Braddy, Haldeen, Chaucer's <i>Book of the Duchess</i> and two of Gran- son's <i>Complaintes</i>	487
Lyon, E. D., Roger de Ware, Cook..	491
Bond, D. F., Two Chap-Book Versions of "The Seven Sages of Rome"	494
Hamm, V. M., Addison and the Pleasures of the Imagination	498
Kern, J. B., The Fate of James Thomson's <i>Edward and Eleanor</i>	500
Basler, R. P., The Publication Date, and Source of Byron's "Trans- lation of a Romaic Love Song"	503
Monk, S. H., Wordsworth's "Unimaginable Touch of Time"	503
Super, R. H., Forster as Landor's Literary Executor	504
Spitzer, Leo, <i>Die Sonne geht zu Gnaden</i> . .	506
Ross, A. S. C., An Example of Vowel-Harmony in a young child	508
Jones, Claude, <i>Ballast-hill, Bridegroom, Common Bail, and Steel</i>	509
Wasserman, E. R., Pre-Restoration Poetry in Dryden's Miscellany	545
Buhler, C. F., A Middle English Prayer Roll	555
Meylan, E. F., La date de l' <i>Oraison de l'Âme fidèle</i> et son importance pour la biographie morale de Marguerite de Navarre	562
Koller, Kathrine, A Chaucer Allusion . .	568
Jones, Claude, Chaucer's <i>Taillynge Ynough</i>	570
Jones, Claude, The Monk's Tale, a Mediaeval Sermon	570
Sale, Helen S., The Date of Skelton's <i>Bowge of Court</i>	572
Orwen, W. R., Spenser and Gosson	574
Loss, H., A Prototype of the Story in <i>Zadig</i> (Ch. III) · <i>Le Chien et le Cheval</i>	576
Watson, H. F., Historic Detail in <i>The Borderers</i>	577
Tracy, C. R., Porphyria's Lover.	579
Bernbaum, Ernest, Recent Works on Prose Fiction Before 1800	580

REVIEWS

	PAGE
Maurice Baudin, Les Bâtaids au théâtre en France. [L Cons]	52
L Rivaillé, Les débuts de P Corneille; V. Vedel, Deux Classiques français vus par un critique étranger [H C Lancaster]	53
A. C. Judson, A Biographical Sketch of John Young, Bishop of Rochester, E B Fowler, Spenser and the System of Courtly Love, Janet Spens, Spenser's <i>Faerie Queene</i> ; M. Bhattacharje, Platonic Ideas in Spenser, W L. Renwick, <i>A View of the Present State of Ireland</i> [Ray Heffner.]	55
R B Sharpe, The Real War of the Theatres [O J. Campbell]	59
Hardin Craig (ed), Essays in Dramatic Literature The Parrott Presentation Volume [H Spencer.]	61
E A Tenney, Thomas Lodge [N B Paradise.]	63
W Y Tindall, John Bunyan Mechanick Preacher. [L C. Wimberly]	64
Eugène Joliat, Smollett et la France [E S. Noyes]	66
R Prinz, Die Schöpfung der <i>Gisla saga Súrssonar</i> [S. Einarsson]	68
M H Law, The English Familiar Essay in the Early Nineteenth Century, T. E M Boll, The Works of Edwin Pugh [W. C. De Vane.]	70
R Shafer, P. E More and American Criticism. [H. M. Jones]	71
W. F Patterson, Three Centuries of French Poetic Theory. [L Cons.]	122
R. L Greene (ed), The Early English Carols [Carleton Brown]	125
A. H Smith (ed.), Three Northumbrian Poems; K. Malone (ed.), <i>Deor</i> ; F Norman (ed.), <i>Waldere</i> [R. Hoops.]	129
A. C Bartlett, The Larger Rhetorical Patterns in Anglo-Saxon Poetry. [A. E. DuBois.]	132
G. D Kelchner, Dreams in Old Norse Literature and Their Affinities in Folklore. [E C Ehrensperger]	133
E. Einarsson, <i>Saga Eiríks Magnússonar</i> [H Hermannsson.]	134
H. Henel, Studien zum Altenglischen Computus [P F Jones.]	136
N. Abercrombie, The Origins of Jansenism; D. M. Eastwood The Revival of Pascal. [H. C. Lancaster.]	137
R Minder, Die religiöse Entwicklung von K P. Moritz auf Grund seiner autobiographischen Schriften. [E H Zeydel.]	138
F O Nolte, The Early Middle Class Drama (1696-1774). [L. M Price.]	140
Carl Grabo, The Meaning of "The Witch of Atlas." [A B. Ballman.]	144
Henri Peyre, Shelley et la France [B. P. Kurtz.]	146
M K Woodworth, The Literary Career of Sir Samuel Egerton Brydges. [F. K. Brown].	147
H. W. Donner (ed), The Browning Box, or the Life and Letters of T L Beddoes [A M Turner.]	149
C. P Cambiaire (ed), East Tennessee and Western Virginia Mountain Ballads [A K Davis, Jr]	150
Theodore Besterman, The Beginning of Systematic Bibliography. [G. P. Winship.]	151

CONTENTS

vii

	PAGE
J Petersen und W v. Olshausen (eds.), Gotthold Ephraim Lessings Werke [W G Howard]	211
E A. Robinson, <i>King Jasper</i> Introduction by Robert Frost. [<i>Lascelles Abercrombie</i>]	218
Clara Marbug, Mr. Pepys and Mr Evelyn. [<i>J O. Hanap</i>]	220
L M. Beattie, John Arbuthnot [<i>Rae Blanchard</i>]	222
S T Williams, The Life of Washington Irving [<i>T. McDowell</i>]	223
Ernest Hoepffner, Les <i>Lais</i> de Marie de France. [<i>Grace Frank.</i>]	225
Karl Jabeig, Aspects géographiques du langage. [<i>Leo Spitzer</i>]	227
Marjorie Nicolson, The Microscope and English Imagination [<i>F. R. Johnson</i>]	229
Thielke, K. L F, Literatur- und Kunstkritik in ihren Wechselbeziehungen, C. M Dowlin, Sir Wm. Davenant's "Gondibert," its Preface, and Hobbes's Answer [<i>A D McKillop</i>]	231
R A. Aubin, Topographical Poetry in XVIII-Century England [<i>A. E Case</i>],	232
Gino Bottiglion, Atlante linguistico-etnografico italiano della Corsica; Les Raisons et principaux caractères de l'ALEIC [<i>Leo Spitzer.</i>]	270
H. C Lancaster, A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century, Part III, 1652-1672 [<i>Louis Cons</i>]	275
Marcel Françon, <i>Albums poétiques</i> de Marguerite d'Autriche [<i>Louis Cons</i>]	279
Andrée Bruel, Romans français du moyen âge, Essais. [<i>Louis Cons</i>]	282
Louis Cons, Etat présent des études sur Villon [<i>Grace Frank</i>]	283
E. Walberg (ed), Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence. <i>La Vie de Saint Thomas Becket.</i> [<i>Raphael Levy</i>]	284
Roger Tisserand, Au Temps de l'Encyclopédie, L'Académie de Dijon de 1740 à 1793, Les Concurients de J-J Rousseau pour le prix de 1754. [<i>A. Schinz</i>]	286
Léon Guichard, L'Œuvre et l'âme de Jules Renard, L'Interprétation graphique cinématographique et musicale des œuvres de Jules Renard [<i>A. Schaffer</i>]	288
Elton Hocking, F. Brunetière; the Evolution of a Critic [<i>L. J Bondy</i>]	290
J. Robles Pazos (ed.), Lope de Vega, Cancionero Teatral. [<i>C. E. Ambal</i>]	291
E H Zeydel, L Tieck, The German Romanticist. [<i>M Thalmann.</i>]	295
Kemp Malone (ed.), <i>Widsith.</i> [<i>H. M. Ayres</i>]	296
M A. Korn, Die Weltanschauung Jonathan Swifts, H Reimers, Jonathan Swift, Gedanken und Schriften über Religion und Kirche; D. N. Smith (ed), The Letters of Jonathan Swift to Charles Ford; H Davis (ed.), <i>The Drapier's Letters to the People of Ireland.</i> [<i>R. Quintana</i>]	298
D L Durling, Georgic Tradition in English Poetry; C. V. Deane, Aspects of Eighteenth-Century Nature Poetry; S H. Monk, The Sublime, M. K Whelan, Enthusiasm in English Poetry (1700-1774). [<i>M. E. Prior.</i>]	302

	PAGE
H. W. Donner (ed.), <i>The Works of T. L. Beddoes</i> . [<i>R. H. Snow.</i>]	306
Kenneth Jackson, <i>Studies in Early Celtic Nature Poetry</i> . [<i>J. J. Parry</i>]	307
L. V. Hathaway, <i>German Literature of the Mid-Nineteenth Century in England and America as Reflected in the Journals 1840-1914</i> . [<i>B. Q. Morgan.</i>]	355
E. Volkmann, R. F. Arnold, Helene Adolf (eds.), <i>Deutsche Literatur</i> . [<i>Wm R. Gaede</i>]	357
C. C. D. Vail, <i>Lessing's Relation to the English Language and Literature</i> . [<i>W. G. Howard.</i>]	360
G. Minde-Pouet (ed.), <i>Kleists Werke</i> [<i>J. C. Blankenagel</i>]	362
Martin Sommerfeld, <i>Goethe in Umwelt und Folgezeit</i> . [<i>E. Feise.</i>]	364
Herman Pongs, <i>Schillers Urbilder</i> . [<i>Hans Jaeger.</i>]	365
Robert Minder, <i>Un Poète romantique allemand</i> Ludwig Tieck. [<i>E. H. Zeydel.</i>]	367
Joseph Korner (ed.), <i>Krisenjahre der Fruhromantik</i> . [<i>E. H. Zeydel</i>]	369
Frank Spiecker, <i>Luise Hensel als Dichterin</i> [<i>E. H. Zeydel</i>]	371
Emil Ohmann (ed.), <i>Simon Roths Fremdworterbuch</i> [<i>W. Kurrel-meyer</i>]	372
W. A. Berendsohn, <i>Zur Vorgeschichte des Beowulf</i> . [<i>W. F. Bryan</i>]	374
C. S. Baldwin, <i>Three Medieval Centuries of Literature in England, 1100-1400</i> [<i>Kemp Malone</i>]	378
Carleton Brown (ed.), <i>Chaucer, The Pardoner's Tale</i> . [<i>M. B. Ruud</i>]	379
A. H. Smith (ed.), <i>The Parker Chronicle (832-900)</i> . [<i>G. W. Small.</i>]	381
J. D. Wilson, <i>What Happens in Hamlet; Hamlet</i> [edited]; <i>The MS. of Shakespeare's Hamlet and the Problems of its Transmission</i> . [<i>T. M. Parrott</i>]	382
R. C. Wallerstein, <i>Richard Crashaw</i> . [<i>Austin Warren.</i>]	387
W. Skeat (trans.), E. H. Visiak (ed.), <i>Milton's Lament for Damon and His Other Latin Poems</i> . [<i>W. R. Parker.</i>]	388
A. O. Lovejoy and George Boas, <i>Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity</i> . [<i>G. R. Havens</i>]	421
V. de S. Pinto, Peter Sterry, <i>Platonist and Puritan</i> . [<i>A. O. Lovejoy.</i>]	423
E. J. Simmons, <i>Pushkin</i> . [<i>C. A. Manning</i>]	425
Betsy Aikin-Sneath, <i>Comedy in Germany in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century</i> . [<i>C. C. D. Vail</i>]	427
Harvard Tercentenary Publications I. <i>Factors Determining Human Behavior</i> . [<i>George Boas.</i>]	428
J. P. Oakden and E. R. Innes, <i>Alliterative Poetry in Middle English</i> . [<i>H. L. Savage.</i>]	430
W. G. Smith and J. E. Heseltine, <i>The Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs</i> . [<i>B. J. Whiting</i>]	433
Willard Farnham, <i>The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy</i> . [<i>W. W. Lawrence.</i>]	435
C. J. Sisson, <i>Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age</i> ; F. A. Yates, <i>A Study of Love's Labour's Lost</i> ; A. A. Raven, <i>A Hamlet Bibliography</i> ; Theodore Spencer, <i>Death and Elizabethan Tragedy</i> ; P. V. Kreider,	

CONTENTS

ix

PAGE

Elizabethan Comic Conventions; N. B. Allen, The Sources of John Dryden's Comedies, R. G. Noyes, Ben Jonson on the English Stage 1660-1776 [H. Spencer.]	437
Hardin Craig, The Enchanted Glass The Elizabethan Mind in Literature [D. Bush.]	442
G D Willcock and Alice Walker (eds), George Puttenham, <i>The Arte of English Poesie</i> ; H H Hudson (ed.), John Hoskins, <i>Directions for Speech and Style</i> . [D. C. Allen]	444
K O. Myrick, Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman. [W. G. Friedrich.]	445
R. F. Jones, Ancients and Moderns. [R W. Frantz.]	447
A L Reade, Johnsonian Gleanings, Part VII; W B. C Watkins, Johnson and English Poetry Before 1660. [F. A Pottle]	449
Samuel Shellabarger, Lord Chesterfield. [S L. Gulick, Jr.]	451
H A. Eaton, Thomas De Quincey, A Biography. [E. J Morley.]	452
George Dillon and E. St V. Millay (trans.), Baudelaire, <i>Flowers of Evil</i> . [E. P. Dargan]	453
M. L. Parrish and B. K Maun, Charles Kingsley and Thomas Hughes. [M. F. Thorp]	454
Frederico Olivero, Francis Thompson [E B Burgum.]	455
N B Fagin (ed), America Through the Short Story. [B C Williams]	457
R. H. Hodgkin, A History of the Anglo-Saxons. [F P. Magoun, Jr.]	510
C. S. Lewis, The Allegory of Love. a study in Medieval tradition. [T. A. Kirby.]	515
A. O Lovejoy, The Great Chain of Being [Raphael Demos.] . .	518
G Witkowski (ed), Goethes <i>Faust</i> ; P M Palmer and R P More, Sources of the Faust tradition, E. Beutler (ed.), Jahrbuch des Freien Deutschen Hochstifts Frankfurt am Main, Goethe-Kalender auf das Jahr 1937. [E. Feise]	521
E. G. Gudde, Social Conflicts in Medieval German Poetry. [P. R Pope]	524
W. Keller und H Hecht, Shakespeare-Jahrbuch, L. L Schucking, Der Sinn des <i>Hamlet</i> , E E. Stoll, Hamlet the Man, L Moischbach, Shakespeares Caesarbild, L. W. Kahn, Shakespeares Sonnette in Deutschland; C. F. E Spurgeon, Shakespeares Imagery; R. David, The Janus of Poets; A Baesecke, Das Schauspiel der englischen Komodianten in Deutschland; J. Isaacs, Production and Stage-Management at the Blackfriars Theatre; P. Simpson, The Theme of Revenge in Elizabethan Tragdey; M. Hagedorn, Reformation und spanische Andachtsliteratur: Luis de Granada in England, H. Thieme, Zur Verfasserfrage des dekkerschen Stuckes "The Pleasant Comedy of Old Fortunatus." [R. A. Law]	526
A. C. Sprague, Shakespeare and The Audience. [T. W. Baldwin.] . .	530
A. Bitter, William Whitehead; H. O. White (ed.), The Works of Thomas Purney. [R. F. Jones]	533

	PAGE
Louis Landré, Leigh Hunt (1784-1859). [G. D. Stout]	534
E. K. Brown, Studies in the Text of Matthew Arnold's Prose Works. [H. F. Lowry]	536
H. Dériex, La Poésie française contemporaine, 1885-1935, E Raynaud, En Marge de la Mêlée symboliste; Cinquantenaire du Symbolisme [A. Schinz]	537
A. Tortoreto and J. G. Fucilla, Bibliografia analitica tassiana (1896-1930). [C. B. Beall]	540
J. E. Mason, Gentlefolk in the Making; K. G. Hornbeak, The Complete Letter-Writer in English, 1568-1800 [W. L. Ustick]	593
Ethel Seaton, Literary Relations of England and Scandinavia in the Seventeenth Century. [O. J. Campbell]	596
C. G. Smith, Spenser's Theory of Friendship; Jewel Wurtsbaugh, Two Centuries of Spenserian Scholarship [M. Y. Hughes.]	598
E. H. Weatherly (ed.), <i>Speculum Sacerdotale</i> [W. O. Ross.]	601
R. J. Allen, The Clubs of Augustan London [A. D. McKillop]	602
A. Gotze, W. Horn, F. Maurer (eds.), Germanische Philologie. Festschrift für Otto Behaghel [Otto Springer]	604
G.-G. Nicholson, Un nouveau principe d'étymologie romane [Leo Sptzer]	605
L. Batiffol, Richelieu et Corneille; E. Droz, le Manuscrit des <i>Plaintes d'Acante</i> de Tristan l'Hermite; A. Tilley, Madame de Sévigné; P. J. W. Van Malssen, Louis XIV d'après les pamphlets répandus en Hollande [H. C. Lancaster.]	607
J. W. Beach, The Concept of Nature in Nineteenth-Century English Poetry. [A. B. Ballman.]	609
D. F. Smith, Plays about The Theatre in England [Rudolf Kirk]	611
M. J. Sargeaunt, John Ford. [S. B. Ewing.]	613

BRIEF MENTION

F. Elkin, Walter Savage Landor's Studies of Italian Life and Literature. [S. T. Williams.]	72
R. W. Armour, Barry Cornwall. [H. M. Jones.]	73
C. B. Judge, Specimens of Sixteenth-Century English Handwriting. [S. A. Tannenbaum.]	74
A. H. Wilson, A History of the Philadelphia Theatre 1835 to 1855 [N. B. Fagin]	75
V. W. Kennedy and M. N. Barton, S. T. Coleridge. [A. D. Snyder]	75
R. Shafer (ed.), George Gissing, <i>Workers in the Dawn</i> . [R. D. Havens]	76
L. Cooper, Evolution and Repentance. [R. D. Havens.]	76
W. T. Morgan, A Bibliography of British History (1700-1715) [L. I. Bredvold.]	76
M. C. Nahm (ed.), John Wilson's <i>The Cheats</i> . [H. spencer.]	77

CONTENTS

xi

	PAGE
A S Borgman, The Life and Death of William Mountfort. [H. Spencer]	77
R. L. Puidy (ed), R B Sheidan, <i>The Rivals</i> [H. Spencer.]	77
A. Kroner, Die Technik des realistischen Dramas bei Ibsen und Galsworthy [E. Feise]	78
Gwyn Jones (trans), Four Icelandic Sagas. [S. Einarsson]	152
M. B. Forman (ed), The Letters of John Keats [R. D. Havens.]	153
M. S. Serjeantson and L. N. Broughton (eds.), Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature (1934). [R D Havens]	153
J. C. Ghosh and E G. Withycombe, Annals of English Literature, 1475-1925 [R. D Havens.]	153
R W. Armour (ed), The Literary Recollections of Barry Cornwall. [R. D. Havens]	154
O. W. Long, Literary Pioneers Early American Explorers of European Culture. [D Perkins.]	154
E. V. Hitchcock (ed), W Roper, <i>The Lyfe of Sir Thomas Moore, knyghte</i> . [R H. Perkinson]	155
Ezra Pound, <i>Make it New Essays</i> . [A E DuBous]	155
W. W. Greg (ed), The Play of Antichrist from the Chester Cycle [H. R. Patch]	156
W. H. Cornog (ed.), The <i>Anticlaudian</i> of Alain de Lille [H. R. Patch.]	233
W H Bonner, De Quincey at Work [H A. Eaton]	308
E. A Baker, The History of the English Novel. [P. Edgar]	309
E. G. Cox, A Reference Guide to the Literature of Travel [G. B. Parks]	310
R. S. Sibbald, Marionettes in the North of France [H. C. Lancaster.]	311
Ph. A. Becker, Die Narrenspiele des neuentdeckten Mischbands von Treppereldrucken [G. Frank.]	311
S T. Williams and M A Edge, A Bibliography of the Writings of Washington Irving A Check List. [H Spencer]	388
T G Ehrsam and R H Deily, Bibliographies of twelve Victorian Authors [M. Ray]	458
C. S. Singleton (ed.), <i>Canti carnascaleschi del Rinascimento</i> . [C. B. Beall.]	459
A. Castelli, <i>La Gerusalemme liberata</i> nella Inghilterra di Spenser. [C. B. Beall]	459
Al. Ciorănescu, Les Imitations de l'Arioste de P. Desportes [A. Cameron.]	460
L. Lockert (trans.), The Best Plays of Racine [H. C. Lancaster.]	461
Trubners Deutsches Wörterbuch [W. Kurrelmeyer.]	461
F. Behrend, Deutsche Studien, Vorträge und Ansprachen. [W. Kurrelmeyer.]	462
R. Tuve, Seasons and Months [H R. Patch.]	462
H. Hermannsson, The Problem of Wineland [S. Einarsson.]	463
G. A. Plimpton, The Education of Chaucer. [M. B. Ruud.]	464
C. W. Kennedy (trans.), Old English Elegies. [K. Malone.]	465

	PAGE
C. A. Weber, Bristols Bedeutung fur die englische Romantik. [O. E. Holloway.]	466
M. Hearsay (ed.), <i>The Complaint of Henry Duke of Buckingham</i> [D. C. Allen.].	466
E. M. Hinton, Ireland Through Tudor Eyes [J. G. McManaway]	467
H. Mulder, Cognition and Volition in Language [G. Boas.]	467
R. F. Brinkley (ed.), <i>English Poetry of the Seventeenth Century</i> . [W. G. Friedrich].	468
B. D. Roberts, Mr. Bulkeley and the Pirate [O. Jones]	542
E. Reynolds, <i>Early Victorian Drama (1830-1870)</i> . [A. E. DuBois]	615
M. C. Bradbrook, <i>The School of Night</i> . [W. G. Friedrich].	616
A. B. Langdale, Phineas Fletcher. [R. Kirk.]	617
W. G. Johnson, Thomson's Influence on Swedish Literature in the Eighteenth Century. [H. Drennon.]	618
W. B. Yeats (ed.), <i>The Oxford Book of Modern Verse, 1892-1935</i> . [R. Hillyer]	618
W. T. Morgan, <i>A Bibliography of British History (1700-1715)</i> . [L. I. Bredvold]	619
J. Siebert, <i>Der Dichter Tannhauser</i> . [F. H. Wilkens]	620
E. de Selincourt (ed.), <i>Dorothy Wordsworth, George and Sarah Green</i> [R. D. Havens.]	620

CORRESPONDENCE

L. H. Wright, <i>A Bibliography of the American Novel</i>	234
E. B. Ham, <i>The Library of the Association Canado-américaine</i>	542

NECROLOGY

Gustav Gruenbaum, 1885-1937	312
-----------------------------	-----

Errata	615
--------	-----

Modern Language Notes

Volume LII

JANUARY, 1937

Number 1

A NEW LYDGATE-CHAUCER MANUSCRIPT

Although Morgan manuscript No. 4 was briefly and incorrectly described in the catalogue of the library of Theodore Irwin,¹ a collection now forming part of The Pierpont Morgan Library, it does not appear to have been noted by any of the recent editors and bibliographers² of the poetical works of Chaucer and Lydgate. As this is a manuscript of considerable literary importance, a complete description together with the texts of the two short poems will, no doubt, be found useful.

The Pierpont Morgan Library, MS 4

MS. on vellum, written and illuminated in England about the middle of the XVth century. The decoration is slight, consisting of a large initial letter W in blue and pink brightened with gold, and a three-sided border in the same colouring on folio 1r; numerous smaller initials in gold on a blue or pink border throughout the book.

The handwriting is clear, prose notes to the text, such as chapter-headings, are written in red; the first seven leaves are stained without affecting the text.

78 leaves (collation a-i⁸ k⁸), measuring 10 x 6½ inches, 33 lines to a full page. Small quarto (10¼ x 7 inches); brown levant morocco gold tooled in acorns, by Bedford of London

On folio 1r is the signature of John Davy (which occurs again on f. 77r) in a hand of the XVth century; also on f. 1r, the name Gilbert North; on ff. 43v and 44r, William Darye (or Davye ?)

¹ "No 1829. Lydgate (John). The History Sege and Destructioun of Thebes. Folio, crushed levant morocco, with morocco case, by F. Bedford. MS. of the XIVth (sic) century on vellum" *Catalogue of the Library belonging to Theodore Irwin*, New York, 1887.

² It was omitted by H. N. MacCracken, *Minor Poems of John Lydgate*, E. E. T. S., 1911 & 1934; by E. P. Hammond, *Chaucer, a bibliographical Manual*, New York, 1908; by J. E. Wells, *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English*, Yale University Press, 1916 and years following; by

- Contents: 1) Lydgate's *Siege of Thebes*. ff 1r-74r
 2) *A lenvoye to all prynces and lordes that be dysposyd to be lecherous* ff 74r-75r
 3) Lydgate's *Letter to Gloucester*. ff. 75r-77r
 4) Chaucer's *Compleynt vn-to his purse* f. 77r

If we examine the short poems³ in the order in which they are found in the manuscript, the first is the *Lenvoye to all prynces*. Despite the title, this work is not an independent poem at all but consists of a number of extracts made from Lydgate's *Fall of Princes*. The eleven stanzas thus compiled correspond to the following lines of Lydgate's work (ed. Henry Bergen, The Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1923-27):

Stanza I—Book II, ll 4586-4592

Stanzas II-X—Book III, ll 1569-1582 and 1590-1638.

Stanza XI—Book I, ll. 5510-5516.

Similar excerpts from the *Fall of Princes* are far from uncommon; they may be found in MSS. Harley 367, Harley 2251, Addit. 29729, Ashmole 59 and Pepys 2011, to name but a few.

In the recent publication of Part II of Lydgate's *Minor Poems* (E. E. T. S., O. S. 192, pp. 665-7), the *Letter to Gloucester* was printed from MS. Harley 2255 with collations from all the other manuscripts known to Prof. MacCracken (they are Harley 2251, Addit. 34360, Lansdowne 699, Leyden Vossius 9 and Pepys 2011). In order to complete the list of variant readings, the text of the Morgan MS. is printed below; corrections were made, where absolutely necessary, from the critical edition.

This is the copy of þe letter that Dan John Lidgate, Monke of Bury, sent to Homfrey Duke of Glouceter for mony for the makynge of Bochas.

Right myghty prynse and hit be youre willle
 Condiscende leyser for to take
 To see the content of this litille bille
 Whiche whan y wrote myne hande y felte quake

Erdmann and Ekwall, *Lydgate's Siege of Thebes*, E. E. T. S., 1911 & 1920; etc.

³ A list of the variant readings of the *Siege of Thebes* has been made and awaits a publisher. We may note, in passing, that the Morgan text is closest to that in MS. 152 of Christchurch Library, Oxford, the next closest is in Pepys MS. 2011. The MS. may therefore be placed on Prof. Ekwall's chart between the Christchurch and Pepys MSS. In addition, the contents of the Pepys MS. are the same as those in the Morgan MS. except that Chaucer's *Compleynt* is omitted.

- 5 Tokyn of morenyng y wered clothes blake
 By cause my puise was fallyn in grete rerage
 Lynyng owtewarde the guttes were owte shake
 Onely for lak of plate and of coynage

(I souhte leechys for a restoratiff)

- 10 In whom y founde no consolacyoun
 Appotykyrse for a comfortatyfe
 Dragge nore dya was none in Bury toune
 Bottome off his stomak was turnyd vp-so-doune
 A laxatyfe dyd hym so grete outrage
 15 Made hym sclender by a consompcioun
 Onely for lak of plate and of coynage

Shippe was there none nore saylis rede of hewe
 The wynde frowarde to make hem þer to londe
 The flode was passyd and sodenly of newe
 20 A lowe grounde-ebbe was faste by the stronde
 That no maryner durste take on honde
 To caste an anker for streightnes of passage
 The costom skaise as folke may vndirstonde
 Onely for lak of plate and of coynage

- 25 There was no tokyn sent downe from the toure
 As any gossomer the counterpeyse was light
 A fretyng etyke causyd his langoure
 By a cotydyan whiche helde hym day and night
 Sol and luna were clypsed of her light
 30 There was no crosse nore prynt of no vysage
 Hys lynyng derke þer were no plates bright
 Onely for lak of plate and of coynage

Harde to lyke hony owte of a marbulle stone
 for there ys nethir lycoure nore moystoure

- 35 An earnest grote whan hit is dronke and gone
 Bargeyn of merchantes stont in aventure
 My purse and y be callyd to the lure
 Off indyngense oure stuf leyde in morgage
 But ye my lorde may alle my sorwe recure
 40 With a receyte of plate and of coynage

Not sugred plate made by þe appotycary
 Plate of bright metalle yeveth a mery sowne
 In Bokelleisebery ys none suche lettuary
 Golde ys a cordialle gladdest confeccoun

- 45 Ageyne etiques of olde consumpcioun
 Aurum potabile (for) folke ferre ronne in age

9 Shippe was there none nore soylis rede of hewe MS.

46 (for) omitted in MS.

- In quynt essense beste restauracioun
 With syluyr plate enprentid with coynage
- O sely bylle why arte þou not ashamed
 50 So malepertely to shewe oute thy constreynt
 But pouerte hathe so nye thy tone atamyd
 That nichill habet ys cause of thy compleynt
 A drye tesyk maketh olde men fulle feynt
 Rediest wey to renewe there corage
- 55 Ys a fresshe dragge of no spices meynt
 But of bright plate enprentyd with coynage
- Thou mayste afferme as for thyn excuse
 Thy bareyne soyle ys sole and solytary
 Off crosse nere pyle there ys none recluse
 60 Prent nore inpressioun in alle thy seyntwary
 To conclude brefely and not to tary
 There ys none noyse herde in thy ermytage
 God sende sone a gladder letuary
 With a clere sone of plate and of coynage

Apart from the fact that the scribe, in place of the original first line of Stanza II, wrote the first line of Stanza III, the text in the Morgan MS. is quite good. The poem as a whole requires a few notes; many of the medical terms here employed are used by Lydgate in other poems, notably in the *Secrees of old Philisoffres* and in the *Rules of Health*.⁴ No doubt these will be fully described in the very necessary volume of notes which must complete the Early English Text Society's edition of the *Minor Poems*. "Bokellersebery" in line 43 is, on the other hand, of unusual interest. This can, without question, be identified with "Buckles burie," a street in Cheape-ward which ran, in Lydgate's day, south of the Poultry. Stow, in his *Survey of London* (London, George Purslowe, 1618), describes it thus (p. 477):

This whole streete, called Buckles burie, on both the sides throughout, is possessed of Grocers & Apothecaries.

and it appears that the druggists and vendors of herbs had their shops there from the earliest times till the Great Fire of London. Stow derives the name of the street in this fashion:

First, is Buckles burie, so called of a Mannor and Tenements pertaining to one Buckle, who there dwelled, and kept his Courts This Mannor is supposed to be the great Stone building, yet in part remaining

⁴ Compare with my note in *Medium Aevum*, February, 1934, pp. 51-56.

on the South side of the streete, . . This Tower (built by Edward III), of late yeeres, was taken downe by one Buckle, a Grocer, meaning, in place thereof, to haue set vp and builded a goodly frame of Timber but the said Buckle greedily labouring to pull downe the old Towe, a part thereof fell vpon him, which so sore bruised him, that his life was thereby shortened. and another, that married his widow, set vp the new prepared Frame of Timber, and finished the Worke.

It is more likely, however, that Stow was merely citing an old tradition, and that the name of the street is considerably older. It appears to be connected with the Bokerell family, prominent in London affairs throughout the thirteenth century. According to the London Chronicle in MS. Harley 565, Andrew Bokerell was mayor of London from the fifteenth to the twenty-first years of the reign of Henry III (1230/1-1236/7); a Walter Bokerell is mentioned in vi Henry III; a Stephan Bokerell in xi-xii Henry III; and a Mathew Bokerell in xl Henry III. Contemporary records mention the court (bury) of the Bokerells. In time, "Bokerells-bury" became, apparently, "Bokellersebery" and this was, probably, directly shortened to "Bucklesbury," the unfortunate end of the grocer Buckle having, no doubt, contributed somewhat to this change. "Bokellersebery" is also of Shakespearian interest, as Falstaff, in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (III, iii, quoted from the first Folio), says:

Come, I cannot cog, and say thou art this and that, like a-manie of these lispng-hauthorne buds, that come like women in mens apparrell, and smell like Bucklers-berry in simple time.

Chaucer's *Compleynt vn-to his Purse* is contained in the last 21 lines of the manuscript. The text comprises the three stanzas of the poem but not the *Envoy*, which is probably of a later date as it could only have been written after Henry IV had been declared King (Sept. 30th, 1399). This poem is preserved in the following manuscripts: Fairfax 16 (F), University Library, Cambridge, MS. Ff. 1. 6 (C), Pepys 2006 (P), Harley 7333 (H), Harley 2251 (Ha), Addit. 22139 (A) and Addit. 34360 (Ad). The first two stanzas only appear in MS. 176 of Caius College, Cambridge (Cc). Of these, Ha A and Ad lack the *Envoy*. The variant readings have been taken from the Chaucer Society's transcripts of these manuscripts (Publications LVIII and LXXVII) and for Cc from MacCracken's edition in *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. xxvii, p. 228.

The compleynt off Chaucer's vn-to his purse.

- To you my purse and to none oþer wight
 Compleyne y for ye be my lady dere
 I am so soȝ nowē þat ye bethe light
 ffor certes but yf ye make me hevy cheie
 5 Me were as lefe to be leyde vpon my bere
 ffor whiche vn-to you mercy thus y crye
 Bethe hevy ayen or elles y muste dye

II

- Nowe fouchesaufe þis day or hit be night
 That y of you the blesfulle sounē may here
 10 Or se youre coloure lyke the sonne bright
 That of youre yelownes hathe no pere
 Ye bethe my lyfe ye bethe my hertes stere
 Quene of comferte and of company
 Bethe hevy ayen or elles y muste dye

III

- 15 Nowe purse þat bethe my hertis light
 And souerayne lady in þis worlde here
 Oute of this tounē helpe me þis night
 Sith that ye wolle not be my tresoriere
 ffor y am shaue as nye as any frere

1 and to) and Cc. nonother Ha Ad. 2 ye) yow Ha Ad Cc be) bene
 C, om Ha Ad 3 nowē) om Ha Ad. ye) you Cc (*always*) bethe) been
 F C, bien Ha Ad, be H P A Cc 4 ffor) But P, That A yf) om P A Cc
 hevy) any A 5 as) als H, a Cc to) om F H C P A vpon) on Ha Ad.
 my) om. P Ha Ad 6 your F H C P A Ha Ad Cc. 7 Beoþe H, be P A y
 muste) must I Ha Ad Cc, mote I F H C P A.

8 voucheth-sauf F C, voucheþe save H, vouch sauf P A wouschsaf Cc
 hit) yet P. 10 Or) To Ha Ad se) shew H lyke) lyche to H, as Ha
 Ad. 11 youre) om. F H P A Cc. youre yelownes) the lewdnesse C.
 yelownes) eye lownesse Ad, yowlenes Cc hathe) hadde F, had H C P A
 Cc no) neuer F C P A, neuer no Cc, neuer his H. 12 *twice* bethe) be
 F C P A Cc, beo H, bien Ha Ad (*first only*) lyfe) light Ha Ad. stere)
 feere Ha Ad 13 and of) and A company) good companye F C P A, all
 company Cc 14 Beoþe H, By P, Be A Cc y muste) must I Ha Ad Cc,
 moote I F H C P A.

15 *read*. Now (Yee H) purse that ben to me my lyves lyght *in* F H C P A.

read. Now purse that beth to me my lyf my light *in* Ad Ha

16 souerayne) saveour F H C P A lady) as doun F C P A, as H. in)
 downe in Ha Ad here) doune here H. 17 þis night) thurgh your
 myght F C Ha Ad, þorow your myte H P A 18 Syn F C P A. wille
 H P, wylle C, wil A Ha Ad. nat bene F C, not beo H. 19 as nye) als
 nyghe H, om. C as any) as is a F, as ys any C


20 ffor which vn-to you mercy thus y crye
 Bethe hevy ayen or elles y must dye
 Explicit

20 read But yet I pray vnto your cutesye *m* F H C P A

read: ffor whiche vnto yowre mercy I crye *m* Ha Ad.

21 Beoþe H, Biethe Ad y must) must I Ha Ad, moote I F H C P.
 must) *om.* A

The traditional grouping of the MSS. is a) F C H Ha Ad and Cc and b) A and P. This arrangement can be somewhat modified and corrected; if we examine the variants of lines 5, 11, 16 and 20, two major classes of manuscripts are immediately discernible 1) F C P H A and Cc and 2) Ha Ad and M (Morgan MS. 4). In the second group, Ha and Ad have long been recognized as sister-manuscripts, M differs from this sub-group particularly in lines 3 (nowe), 5 (vpon), 10 (Or *and* lyke), 12 (lyfe *and* stere), 16 (in), and in line 20. In the other class there are again two quite definite sub-groups 1) F and C and 2) P A and Cc. The essential points of difference here may be seen in line 4 (F and C agree in reading "For" and only P A and Cc omit "yf"), in line 7 ("be" is found only in P and A); in line 8 (F and C have "voucheth-sauf," while P and A have "vouch sauf"), in line 17 (F and C read "thurgh," while P and A have "þorow"), also, although only orthographical, in line 3 ("bethe" appears in F and C as "been" and in P and A as "be"). The chart on the basis of these tests is:



M has a number of readings that occur in no other manuscript: notably in lines 6, 15 and 17 (in addition to having "y muste" in lines 7, 14 and 21). These may be considered mere errors, scribal emendations, or (possibly less likely) the readings of Chaucer's original lines before they were remodelled for Henry IV.

Skeat (*Minor Poems of Chaucer*, Oxford, 1896, p. 397) called

attention to the note of impatience expressed in line 8; and, taken in connection with line 17, his opinion was,

Out of this tounne This seems to mean—'help me to retire from London to some cheaper place.' At any rate, *tounne* seems to refer to some large town, where prices were high. From the tone of this line, and that of l. 8, I should conclude that the poem was written on some occasion of special temporary difficulty, irrespectively of general poverty, and that the *Envoy* was hastily added afterwards, without revision of the poem itself.

Other scholars have been inclined to see in "this tounne" a reference to Greenwich. It has been supposed, on the evidence of the *Lenvoy to Scogan*, that Chaucer lived in Greenwich in 1393/4. In that year and in the years following, Chaucer was in considerable financial and legal difficulties, indeed, a sheriff, presumably on legal business, reported that he could not locate the poet. Does line 17 in the Morgan MS. mean that Chaucer wanted money to enable him to leave Greenwich and thus avoid an expected encounter with the sheriff?

It seems scarcely probable that the poem was actually written for presentation to Henry IV between September 30th and October 12th, 1399. In line 17, Chaucer expresses a desire to leave town. As we have seen, Skeat was of the opinion that, for the sake of economy, Chaucer wanted enough money to retire from London, but three months later the poet took the lease of a house in Westminster for fifty-three years. It may be argued that Chaucer was hoping for just enough money to pay the cost of moving and that only Henry IV's munificence made it possible for the poet to remain in London, but the urgency of the request makes this doubtful. If he was planning to move, one would hardly expect a last-minute appeal for the necessary money; on the other hand, if Chaucer merely needed money urgently, why did he say "Oute of this towne helpe me"? Indeed, considering the legal and financial disputes he was apparently involved in at this time, Chaucer needed no fictitious reason for his petition.

The lines (apart from the *Envoy*) suggest a date not later than May 4, 1398, for on that day King Richard took Chaucer "into his special protection, forbidding him for two whole years to be arrested or sued by anybody except on a plea connected with land." After that date, Chaucer could have had no reason to press for money so urgently, or, for that matter, to leave town precipitously. This is true not only of the poem as it stands in the Morgan MS.

but also in the other MSS.; the Morgan text (in line 17) mainly emphasizes Chaucer's immediate need of money. This argues for a date earlier than May 4th, 1398, in that case, the Morgan text may be construed to represent the earlier version of the poem.

CURT F. BÜHLER

*Pierpont Morgan Library,
New York City*

SPRING IN CHAUCER AND BEFORE HIM

An interesting article by J. E. Hankins in *Modern Language Notes*, 1934 (XLIX, 80-3), notes relationships between Chaucer's seasons-introduction to the *Canterbury Tales* and the *Pervigilium Veneris*, and suggests that Chaucer had this poem fairly definitely in mind in writing the famous fourteen lines. I was the more interested in the point because of an attempt to prove, in a dissertation published in Paris in 1933,¹ that the Prologue as well as Chaucer's other references to the seasons spring from a complicated tradition of seasons-description in Latin, French and Middle English, and from no single 'source'; this tradition may be traced from Lucretius and Virgil through later poems (such as the *Pervig. Ven.*), through Carolingian poetry, Gohardic poets, encyclopaedists and comput-writers, through Old French lyric and romance, was given new emphasis and relationships because of the importance of the seasons in astrological and other 'scientific' treatises, and in art, and appears in Middle English (particularly in Chaucer and Lydgate) with the varied and rich characteristics which so long a history and process of accretion would inevitably give it.

It does not seem at all unlikely that Chaucer read and remembered the spring-references in the *Pervig. Ven.* But he was, I believe, consciously following a long-standing and complicated tradition of which this Latin poem, and the other poems previously pointed out as sources, were only isolated and to him not extraordinarily important examples. Chaucer's seasons-descriptions, particularly that in the Prologue, are a sort of amalgam, fusing many lines of development. They are a composite, and include: semi-scientific details (like his droghte of Marche and mounting licour of April), which he probably took directly from such a manual as the *Secreta Secretorum*; figures like Zephirus, Flora

and Natura so familiar in Roman and Carolingian poetry that they had become the rhetorical stock-in-trade (for example) of hymn-writers and Goliards, notions like that of the symbolic life-bringing figure of Nature or Venus or Ver, *copulatrix amorum*, who reappears throughout Latin and vernacular mediaeval poetry, early and late, to Spenser and beyond him; the courtly garden-of-love settings of a French romance tradition in which Chaucer's favorite details had appeared and re-appeared; conventional descriptive details in a persistent rhetorical idiom both traditional and current in Latin verse, zodiacal and astrological details from written and pictorial sources; remnants of ideas discussed by the encyclopaedists in their treatment of the seasons, figures and emphases taken from the artistic tradition as it appeared in MS. illumination, sculpture and other mediums.

I shall take up some of the specific details underlined by Mr. Hankins and indicate the complicated background which I believe prevents us from pointing to Chaucer's specific 'source' for them. I shall not load this short note with bibliographically complete references, since these may be found in the publication referred to (here abbreviated as *S and M*).¹

To take the simplest detail first: the *shoures* of *Aprille* which *perced to the rote* the *droghte of Marche*, and *bathed every veyne in swich licour* that the flowers were from that *vertu* engendered, enabling Zephyrus to bring to bud the *tendre croppes* or tops of green things on every *holt and heeth*. This is a typical detail in the 'scientific' description of spring. The *Secreta Secretorum* treatment of the season 'Ver,' and that in the related *De natura rerum* of Bartholomaeus Angelicus, are similar, in temper and point, to this one of Chaucer's, in contra-distinction to various others in which he follows other traditions; parallel details are the zodiacal dating, the movement of the 'humours' (bound up until this season when the 'moist and hot' qualities reign) up through the roots into the 'crops' of trees and herbs making them flower, the blowing of the wind, the exciting of the birds to love, the changed mood of all creatures, impelled by Nature to the engendering of their kind.² Bartholomaeus' treatise and others like it were well known; the *Secreta Secretorum* (to which Chaucer

¹ *Seasons and Months: Studies in a Tradition of Middle English Poetry*, Paris, 1933. References to pages.

² *S and M* chap. ii, esp. pp. 51-8.

probably refers, as the 'secre of secrees,' in *CYT* 894) had an exceedingly wide circulation; the seasons material particularly, which there finds its place in medical advice for different seasons, reappears with the same details and emphases in many similar or dependent 'scientific' manuals—astrological, medical or cosmological—and became a common element in the seasons tradition. A French didactic romance like *Les Echecs Amoureux* will utilize the details in an obviously directly dependent form (incidentally, its description uses the very word 'vaines' to which Mr. Hankins points in the *Pervig. Ven.*—making a parallel between its *venas* and Chaucer's *veyne*).³ In an English romance like the '*Gest Hystoriale*' of the *Destruction of Troy* there is not only 'Marche with his mayn droghte' but 'zeforus,' the zodiacal dating, this same moisture-detail and others.⁴ In typical late French romance descriptions like those in Deschamps' *Fiction du Lyon* the same details occur, with additions from other strains in the tradition; such additions, which I select because they are pointed to as parallels between Chaucer and the *Pervig. Ven.* in the article referred to, are an elaborate treatment of the *Natura* figure, a stress on her powers as *copulatrix amorum*, the 'painting' of the earth in spring.⁵ The various 'scientific' details appeared in a great many widely-separated places (*v. S. and M.* ch. 11); the idiom of their expression was of course affected (as in Chaucer) by other elements in the seasons tradition, but the peculiar character given to a seasons-description by the introduction of this kind of detail persists underneath differences in phraseology and serves to define a separable strain in the tradition. To compare Chaucer's *Prologue* passage with, *e. g.*, that in *LGW*, is to see a case in point.

As Mr. Hankins says, the *Pervig. Ven.* praises Venus as the bringer of life-giving showers, the goddess of fertility and *copulatrix amorum* who gives each creature its mate—a rather different figure from the *Natura* of Alanus. However, this figure in one guise or another, often in almost exactly that which Chaucer gives her, embodies the most constantly recurring emphasis within the tradition of seasons-description, from Lucretius to Spenser. She is oftenest '*Natura*,' sometimes '*Venus*'—as either of these figures (or by the transference of her powers to the God of Love)

³ Ed Sieper, vv 99 ff.

⁴ *ETS*, orig. ser. 39, 56, *e. g.* vv 4029 ff; *S and M* 69, 172

⁵ *Soc des anc textes fr.*, Deschamps, *Œuv. compl.*, VIII, 307-8.

she comes to have a traditional place in the seasons-passages of Court-of-Love romances, she is sometimes 'Ver'; in later poems or sketchier descriptions she is degraded into 'Flora.' In hymns, encyclopaedic treatments of the seasons, Christian Latin poetry like Sedulius's or Venantius's, she loses her identity in the merging of this concept with the notion of God's renewal of the earth in spring—a parallel and symbol of course of the Resurrection. In all her appearances, however, she not only retains those powers which characterize her for example in the *Pervig. Ven.*, but even externally remains throughout these mutations a curiously constant element in the seasons-tradition—her powers demonstrated by the same recurrent series of details, her form and person visualized by the poet in a similar manner, the emphasis upon her serving to segregate off the seasons-descriptions in which she appears as a definite 'kind' within the whole tradition. With this rich and confused but unified background, I do not think Chaucer could so much as say the word 'Nature' to himself without the immediate association of very many examples of this Natura-Venus-Ver-Love figure, all the details of her characteristic aspect and powers beating in upon his imagination. Nor do I think that a poet of as late a date as the xiv. century could possibly separate the *Venus-copulatrix-amorum* aspect of her, which gave her her firm place in the regular garden-of-love spring, from the *Natura-creatrix* aspect which was stressed in more didactic descriptions, nor these again from the classical-rhetorical personification of *Ver*.

Long before Chaucer's time the various aspects of her character have been so often intermingled, re-arranged, re-combined, that the sorting out of one emphasis from another is almost impossible; one can only point to a very great many analogues and note that Chaucer shows as do other poets in lesser degree the fusion of the various strains in the tradition. There is to be sure a different element emphasized in Alanus's sermonizing Natura than in Chaucer's Nature in the *Parl. of Foules*. Yet we find everywhere Chaucer's lover-uniting goddess, who joins by love all things, both elements and creatures: in the Nature of Machaut's *Remède de Fortune* who does for the creatures of the whole world what 'Esperance' does for the single lover—'leur donne clarté, chalour, Joie et plaisence en leur amour';⁶ or in the Nature of Deschamps' *Fiction du*

⁶ *Soc. des anc. textes fr.*, Machaut, *Œuv.*, II, v. 2239.

Lyon, a goddess of generation who brings all creatures together so as to continue their kinds upon earth.⁷ Or in the Nature 'maistresse des elemens' who gives all creatures their instinctive capacities, makes all things grow, clothes the earth with her 'robes,' in Guillaume de Deguileville's *Pelerinage de vie humaine*.⁸ Or in the shiningly beautiful Lady who appears in the midst of a spring landscape and discourses upon her powers, in many other romances, whether she is styled 'Love' or 'Nature.'⁹ In the Garden-of-Love romances the vision of this figure is usually vouchsafed to a quester in the same position as Chaucer's—a spectator-poet to whom love is denied; it would be dangerous to regard this similarity as a definite link between the *Pervig. Ven.* and Chaucer.⁹ The 'craft and mesure' by which she has 'ywrought' all things is the usual subject of Nature's discourse, Chaucer's bowers and halls of branches are one example; as in Chaucer it is her empery over green things and flowers and over the elements which is oftenest stressed. Always in a spring landscape, she almost always mentions these particular powers. The early xv. century English *Death and Liffe* is a convenient independent example of a similarly envisaged Lady Nature—here called 'Liffe.' She is indubitably the same figure, on her rounded 'banke' that shimmered and shone through the light of the 'Ladye that longed therein,' with the flowers that flourished where she stepped, the branches that bowed to her, her 'ladyes of loue' and *meanye* of symbolic knights (Hope, Lakinge, Loue, Courtesye), her speech praising the joining of men and women together in 'ioy & gentlenessse.'¹⁰

Thus *Venus-genetrix*-Goddess of courtly love and *Natura-creatrix*-governess of all natural things had become very firmly one figure by Chaucer's time. One is as likely to find one as the other in a Garden of Love, a spring-description, or an Earthly Paradise. The setting in which Chaucer places his Nature in the *PF* is quite as traditional. His hill of flowers and halls of green branches made by Nature are just what we should expect from the many similar backgrounds against which this figure occurs. The setting

⁷ *Soc des anc textes fr.*, Deschamps, *Œuv. compl.*, viii, 307 ff.

⁸ Ed. Sturzinger, Roxb Club, 1893, p 49 ff.

⁹ The xv c *Chemin de Vaillance* is a good example of the latter (Royal MS. 14 E 11), v *S and M* 113 f., 116 ff, 111 ff

¹⁰ Ed. Hanford and Steadman, *SP.*, xv (1918), 263, 270; v *S and M* 22.

in the *Pervig. Ven.* is an analogue, like the others; actually as we visualize the settings in poem after poem we find Chaucer closer both in concept and in detail to such typical descriptions as that of *Natura* in her lovely dwelling on a hill where the flowers never fade and the trees are always green, in Alanus's *Anticlaudianus*,¹¹ or of *Natura* in Jean de Hauteville's *Archithrenius* (xii. c.), enthroned amidst flowers, and as so often (and like Chaucer's *Nature*) harmonizer of the warring elements.¹²

These examples of a similar figure and a similar setting are most probably just analogous manifestations of a common concept and a traditional figure. Chaucer probably read some of them. Since I have treated the figure more fully elsewhere, I have here merely mentioned examples to show how widespread in place and time this connection was, and how difficult it is to point out definite source-relationships between two works when there is such a very great number of intervening appearances of the convention. Earlier appearances of the figure, as *Natura creatrix* or as the traditionally personified *Ver*, are simpler, she is sometimes a mere rhetorical figure, in Carolingian examples we can still make some attempt at sorting out one emphasis from another (cf. the two important *conflictus* poems in which *Ver* appears as interlocutor or peacemaker: the viii. c. *Confl. veris et hiemis* [?Alcuin's, S and M 37, 15], and the *De rosae et liliique certamine* of Sedulius Scottus [*ibid.*, 37]; or v. Walafrid Strabo's *De Cultura Hortorum* [ix. c., *ibid.*, 16, 194], or the *Gesta Berengarii Imperatoris* [x. c., *ibid.*, 18, 196]). In earlier references, she has not yet taken on all the cosmological powers of the later *Natura*, nor become the goddess of harmony and accord who, as the 'Love' of a Garden-of-Love poem, is that *Venus* re-interpreted who is a parent of Spenser's *Venus*. But by the later periods these various strains are so intermingled that it would be strange if we found them in Chaucer other than as we do—fused into a rich whole, compounded of parts still showing their differing provenance.

One or two slighter details remarked by Mr. Hankins should be mentioned. I am aware that to discuss a verbal parallel thus singly is to give it more importance than he intended; but we

¹¹ Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, ccx, 489 ff.

¹² S and M 21 Ed. Wright, *Anglo-Lat Satir. Poets*, Rolls Ser., 1872, i, 369 ff; cf. also the description of *Venus* in her dwelling-place, in Bk. i.

cannot think of Chaucer's 'peynted . . . gardin ful of . . . flowers' as a reminiscence of any particular text; it is perhaps the most familiar example of the useful rhetorical figure *translatio*, and as such occurs in one seasons-reference after another, Latin and French, in Carolingian, Goliardic, romance examples. A rhetorician like Geoffrey de Vinsauf will even choose this to exemplify *translatio* in his discussion of *ornatus difficilis*, taking a cliché spring-description to prove his point: 'Tempora veris "Pingere" flore solum, "nasci" primordia florum . . .'.¹³ Giraldus Cambrensis' 'Ver pictor terrae' is a typical elaboration; Deschamps' *Fiction* shows a typical romance example (*op. cit.*, v. 1996).

Again, that the *Pervig. Ven.* helped to influence Chaucer to date his *Prologue* in April is possible, but I am convinced that he did not intend to 'follow the *Pervig. Ven.* in making April 1 the beginning of the spring season (or the season of showers).'¹⁴ Chaucer could surely not think of Spring, the season, as beginning at any other time than at the entrance of the sun into the Ram, *i. e.*, mid-March; there was too heavy a tradition, thoroughly commonplace, for this detail—in computus, almanacks, encyclopaedic treatments, diagrams, the *Secreta Secretorum* sort of treatise, and a variety of widely diffused 'scientific' material. In the stock calendar-illustrations and diagrams of the months, Spring begins in mid-March with the entrance of Aries (for a treatment of almanack materials *v. S and M* 167 ff., for encyclopaedias *v. ch. iv*, section ii). But March, half of which was technically a winter month, was not the one to select as the spring month *par excellence*. Chaucer does not of course state in the *Prologue* that he is describing the first day of Spring. Rather he is simply saying, 'By the first part of April, when spring is finally under way, then do people's minds run upon journeys to strange places.' Certain traditional associations would help to make him speak of April rather than of March. April and May are the stock months in the spring-references of romances and of the innumerable French and Provençal lyrics. According to the well-worn artistic convention, April was the month of green things and flowers, conventionally illustrated by a young man holding branches or flowers—as in hundreds of *Horae* and Psalters or in sculpture. It was the month of opening; the old parallel between

¹³ *Poet. Nova*, vv. 791 ff.; ed. Faral, *Les arts poet. du xvi. et xiii. s.*, Paris, 1924

¹⁴ Hankins, *op. cit.*, 82 note.

April and *aperio* was a favorite with the computists.¹⁵ We find references to the sun's growing strength as he travels through Aries to Taurus, under Taurus he is 'en sa premere chalur.'¹⁶ April is the most proper month for a spring-introduction. But I do not believe that Chaucer could so forget common knowledge as to think of Spring, the season, as beginning at any other time than that at which hundreds of familiar treatises and diagrams begin it—with the entrance of the sun into the Ram. The first lines of the *Prologue* characterize this spring season—now, in April, in its first strength—as it had come to be traditionally characterized.

And, as always when a great poet makes use of what has gone before him instead of 'inventing,' the result is as different from what has gone before as spring from winter. His sources and models were innumerable; what he makes of them is new and his own.

ROSEMOND TUVE

Connecticut College

CHAUCER AT WORK ON THE COMPLAINT IN THE FRANKLIN'S TALE

From the order in which the *exempla* occur in Dorigen's complaint and in its source, Chs. 41-6 of St. Jerome's *Adversus Jovinianum*,¹ certain definite inferences can be drawn as to the method followed by Chaucer.

The occasion for a listing of heroines in the Latin treatise is Jerome's statement that, even before the coming of Christianity, righteous pagans honored chastity as one of the greatest virtues and strongly disapproved of second marriages. Taking his *exempla* in the order in which he presents them, we can divide them into four groups:

¹⁵ V Manfred of Magdeburg (xi c.): 'De Aprili Ast alia Aprilis quoniam Natura aperitur' (ed. Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, xciv, 644), or Philip de Thaun (xii c.) 'Avrils c'est auvrir' (ed. Mall, v. 723); on computs v. *S and M* 135 ff.

¹⁶ Calendar in B Mus. MS Arundel 157, v. *S and M* 169

¹ J-P Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, xxiii (Paris, 1883), 283-8. The passages used by Chaucer are quoted in Skeat's notes to each of the *exempla* of Dorigen (*Complete Works of Chaucer*, v, 396-9); they will be reprinted in the new *Sources and Analogues of the Canterbury Tales* in the order in which they occur in St. Jerome.

- I.* Miscellaneous illustrations of the pagans' respect for virginity, *e g* their beliefs in special powers bestowed on some virgins (1st half of Ch 41)
- II.* Stories of unmarried women who displayed great courage, mostly committing suicide, to avoid dishonor (2nd half of Ch 41)
- III* Pagan beliefs in virgin birth of some heroes (Ch 42)
- IV* Stories of married women who heroically defended their chastity or at least won admiration by their love of one husband and their fidelity to his memory (foreigners in Chs 43-5, Romans in Ch 46)

Groups *I* and *III*, as they contain no story involving what is on Dorigen's mind, namely suicide, were not used in the *Fkl. T.* and can be left out of consideration here. The heroines of groups *II* and *IV* are listed in Table A in the order of their appearance in Jerome, the figures in the brackets giving the order of the derived passages in Dorigen's complaint, and italics indicating the material not used in that complaint. Table B gives Dorigen's *exempla* in their *Fkl. T.* order, the figures in the brackets indicate the order of the corresponding passages in Jerome; each brace connects steadily increasing numbers, a new brace thus beginning each time Chaucer reverts to an earlier portion of the Latin text.

Table A.

Group II, Ch. 41	1	Filiae Phidonis	(1)
	2	Filia Demotionis	(8)
	3	Quinquaginta virgines Lacedaemoniorum	(2)
	4	Virgo Stymphalis	(3)
	5	<i>Quindecim virgines ludentes</i>	
	6	Filiae Scedasi	(9)
	7	<i>Locridas virgines</i>	
	8	Septem Milesiae virgines	(6)
	9	Nicanor et virgo captiva	(10)
	10	Virgo Thebana et hostis Macedo	(11)
Group IV, Ch 43	11	<i>Dido</i>	
	12	Uxor Hasdrubalis	(4)
Ch 44	13	Conjux Nicerati	(12)
	14	Artemisia uxor Mausoli	(18)
	15	Teuta Illyricorum regina	(19)
	16	<i>Apud eos (Indos) lex est, ut uxor charissima cum defuncto marito cremetur.</i>	
Ch. 45	17	Concubina Alcibiadis	(13)
	18	<i>Uxor Stratonis</i>	
	19	Panthea, uxor Abradatis.	(7)
	20	<i>Uxor quam maritus nudam amico suo monstraverat.</i>	
	21	Rhodogune	(21)

	22	Alcestes	(14)
	23	Penelope	(15)
	24	Laodamia	(16)
Ch 46	25	Lucretia	(5)
	26	Bilia, uxor Dulhi	(20)
	27	<i>Marcia, Catonis filia minor</i>	
	28	Porcia, uxor Brutus, <i>Marcia, uxor Catonis</i>	(17)
	29	<i>Anna</i>	
	30	<i>Porcia minor</i>	
	31	<i>Marcella major</i>	
	32	Valeria	(22)

Table B

1	F.1368	Phidon's daughters	(1)	}
2	1379	Fifty maidens of Lacedaemonia	(3)	
3	1387	Stymphalis	(4)	
4	1399	The widow of Hasdrubal	(12)	
5	1405	Lucrece	(25)	
6	1409	Seven virgins of Miletus	(8)	}
7	1414	Abradates' wife	(19)	
8	1426	Demotion's daughter	(2)	}
9	1428	The daughters of Scedasus	(6)	
10	1431	Nicanor's captive	(9)	
11	1434	Theban maiden and Macedonian foe	(10)	
12	1437	Niceratus' wife	(13)	
13	1439	The concubine of Alcibiades	(17)	}
14	1442	Alcestis	(22)	
15	1443	Penelope	(23)	
16	1445	Laodamia	(24)	
17	1448	Portia	(28)	
18	1451	Artemisia	(14)	}
19	1453	Teuta .	(15)	
20	1455	Bilia	(26)	}
21	1456	Rhodogune	(21)	
22	1456	Valeria	(32)	

From the braces on Table B a first fact comes out very clearly: after his 7th *exemplum*, Chaucer goes through a systematic and thorough scrutiny of Jerome's chapters, revealing a most conscious determination to leave unused no bit of usable material. What had been his intentions up to that point? It is hard to tell how definite was his original plan, but it is clear that it did not involve a very large number of heroines. His *exemplum* 6 already looks like an unpremeditated addition to a completed whole, for this reversion to Jerome's group II is unexpected after Dorigen's half dismissal of the suicidal virgins in F.1395 ff., and the two lines

immediately following that *exemplum* (F. 1412-3) have all the appearance of an attempt at closing the complaint. Much clearer are Chaucer's intentions after the 7th *exemplum*:

F. 1419 What sholde I mo ensamples heerof sayn,
 Sith that so manye han hemselven slayn
 Wel rather than they wolde defouled be?
 I wol conclude that it is bet for me
 To sleen myself than been defouled thus.
 I wol be trewe unto Arveragus

But this unambiguous conclusion is followed by an unexpected veering:

I wol be trewe unto Arveragus,
 Or rather sleen myself in som manere,
 As dide Demociones doghter deere .

A new plan is thus adopted for a larger number of *exempla*. At this same point we note a change in the length and character of each *exemplum*. Whereas Chaucer started making Dorigen tell the full story of each heroine, he now decides that brief allusions—three lines at the most—will be sufficient. There must, however, be suicide committed for the sake of chastity. Because the maidens of Lacedaemonia (Jerome, no. 5) and those of Locris (Jerome, no. 7) kept their virginity without any such drastic means, both *exempla* are discarded. But as Chaucer proceeds and finds more and more of such unwieldy material,² his desire to gather a large number of *exempla* gradually overcomes his scruples as to the degree of appropriateness required of each of them. The first step in this direction is to include the concubine of Alcibiades, who in Jerome is only *mori parata*, and in Chaucer willingly dies, though her death has nothing to do with love of chastity. Next comes Alcestis, then—a much greater concession—simple cases of wifely devotion and fidelity. And after Penelope and Portia have been admitted why not go back for Artemisia and Teuta, formerly discarded, but after all not more un-

² At the opening of group IV he discards in close succession Queen Dido, praised by Jerome for having, as a virtuous widow, preferred burning on Sichaeus' pyre to marrying Jarbas (but Chaucer and his readers knew her story through the *Aeneid* and the *Legend of Good Women*); then Artemisia, famous only for having built an admirable tomb for her husband; Queen Teuta, whose military victories are said to be the reward of her chastity; and the *suttee* widows, who at first sight must have seemed too unfamiliar.

suitable than Penelope? In one more couplet, which probably represents a later afterthought,³ we find crowded in the names of Bilia, Rhodogune, and Valeria. Valeria's glory had consisted in refusing to remarry, Rhodogune's, in killing her nurse, and Bilia's, in never remarking on the smell of her husband's breath!

One last stage in Chaucer's somewhat obstinate accumulation of *exempla* can, I believe, still be studied thanks to the Ellesmere marginal gloss

Memoiandum Strato regulus Vidi & omnes pene Barbares capitulo xxi
primi⁴ Item Cornelia &c Imitentur ergo nupte Theanam Cleobiliam
Goigim (or Goigun) Thymodian Claudias atque Cornelias in fine libri
primi⁵ Singulas has historias & plures hanc materiam concernentes

Irrespective of indications furnished by the other glosses of the same MS., it would seem rather hard to attribute to any scribe all that is implied in those few lines: entire familiarity with every item in Dorigen's long complaint, careful and thorough reading of *Adversus Iovinianum* Book I, Chs. 41-9, and still more careful sifting of material. For the gloss, as discriminatingly as the text, ignores the whole of groups *I* and *III*, and similarly the fifteen Lacedaemonian virgins, the maidens of Locris, Dido, and the revengeful queen who kills her husband in Jerome no. 20. But the wife of Strato and the *suttee* widows as presented in Jerome (*omnes pene Barbari*, etc.) were after all cases in point.⁷ Next comes Cornelia, no worse for Dorigen's purpose than Artemisia or Teuta, and finally a list of five names, most of them certainly new to

³ It is found only in the Ellesmere MS., Additional 35285, and Caxton's second edition of the *Cant. T.*

⁴ It is found in the Ellesmere only; Skeat's note on this point is incorrect.

⁵ The *exemplum* meant here is undoubtedly that on the *suttee* widows, which begins: *Inde, ut omnes pene Barbari, uxoribus plurimas habent*, but it is in Ch 44 that we find it. For the *capitulum xxi* and the 39 at the end of the gloss, both unmistakably clear in the manuscript, I have no explanation to offer.

⁶ This sentence is copied word for word from *Adv. Jov.*, I, 49 *recitat beatus Ieronimus contra Iovinianum in primo suo libro, capitulo 39°*.

⁷ The first, in *Adv. Jov.*, is praised mostly for having stabbed her husband when he wavered instead of killing himself, but the main emphasis could easily have been put on her suicide. The Indian widows, in Jerome, are not reluctant victims, but eager competitors for the honor and privilege of following the deceased husband.

Chaucer, but affording, he would judge from St. Jerome's few words of comment at the end of Book I, material as good as Rhodogune or Bilia.⁸ Thus, whatever modern taste may feel about the length of Dorigen's complaint, it seems that Chaucer still thought of possible additions as improvements.

Another very clear fact to be inferred from the order of the heroines is that Chaucer, at least from *exemplum* 8 onwards, worked with a manuscript of *Adversus Jovinianum* open on his desk. Nothing else would account for his reproducing an order so obviously haphazard in his source. As to the earlier portion of the complaint we cannot be so definite. Chaucer may have worked from memory, closed the complaint for lack of material, and taken it up again later when a copy of *Adversus Jovinianum* once more came within his reach. However, his first choice of three out of Jerome's first four *exempla* and his very similar treatment of them rather favor the view that he used a copy of the treatise from the beginning, reread passages of it rather carefully at first (*exempla* 1 to 3), more rapidly afterwards (nos. 4 to 7),⁹ and concluded the complaint, not necessarily because he deemed it long enough, but more probably because the desire was too strong to proceed with the story of Dorigen and Arveragus. Later, when no longer pressed by such eagerness, he probably felt that he had not done full justice to the opportunity and reopened *Adversus Jovinianum* at Book 1, Ch. 41. It may be worth noting at this point that several MSS. close Dorigen's complaint with F. 1422 or 1424.¹⁰ Whether acci-

⁸ One wonders what kept out of both the text and the gloss the names of Anna, Portia the younger, and Marcella (Jerome's nos 29, 30, and 31), who are not more inappropriate than Chaucer's last heroines. Considerations of metre and rime may have dictated his last selections, as they certainly determined the order of the names *Bilia*, . . . *Rhodogune* and *eek Valeria*.

⁹ Most of his changes seem well motivated. Though F. 1379-81 may be an incomplete or faulty recollection of the Latin treatise, they are more probably due to Chaucer's desire to replace Jerome's introductions with shorter ones. F. 1403-4 and F. 1417-8 are obviously added to keep up the chastity motif and stress the appropriateness of the stories. In F. 1388 *heet Stymphalides* is a mistranslation, *Stymphalidem*, in Jerome, means from Stymphalus, a city in Arcady.

¹⁰ Bodley 414 omits F. 1423-58, Fitzwilliam and Northumberland omit F. 1423-56; Trinity Oxford omits 1425-56, which makes the connection perfect:

1424 I wol be trewe unto Arveragus

1457 Thus pleyned Dorigen a day or tweye, . . .

dental loss is the best of the several explanations possible in this case one should not attempt to guess until more is known about the manuscripts.

Did Chaucer resume the complaint at F. 1425 with great interest and anticipation of pleasure? The answer, here again, is given by the order of the heroines. Of the nine transitions in the series of ten *exempla* that follow each other in the same order as in Jerome, four occur in the middle of a couplet, thus leaving a rime to be carried on. It is noteworthy that this never interferes in the least with Chaucer's regular and systematic picking up of the next of the *exempla* which at that time he deemed usable.¹¹ This implies, not only rapidity and facility in riming, but the absence of any planning of detail, previous ordering of material, or reordering after writing. In other words, it shows us Chaucer as a gifted, justly confident, but very hasty writer. There are other indications of perfunctoriness and lack of interest, most striking of all the insertion of the new *exempla* after F. 1424 instead of F. 1418, and the conveniently vague *for swich a manere cas, for swich manere wo*,¹² to connect heroines whose experiences, recorded by Jerome, were in fact very different. Failing as we do, if not to understand, at least to share the mediaeval's taste for *exempla*, we experience a certain satisfaction in finding that a really great writer treated them, not only with less care than, let us say, his *Clerk's Envoy* (as is obvious enough at first glance), but with a degree of *negligence and rape*, not to say boredom, of which we find very few other instances in his works.

In closing it may be worth noting that Dorigen's twenty-two *exempla* come all from the same one source. St. Jerome's treatment, we admit, was pretty thorough. Still, Chaucer knew of other collections of old stories on virtuous wives:

What seith Valerye, Titus, or Claudyan? (LGW G. 280)

That, in spite of all his eagerness to add to his *exempla*, he should

¹¹ His leaving out temporarily Artemisia and Teuta has nothing to do with rime arrangements, as these two *exempla*, each of which will later fill exactly one couplet, would have come between Niceratus' wife and Alcibiades' concubine, and the first of these stops at the end of a couplet. Similarly, passing from Laodomia to Porcia, Chaucer leaves out Bilis, whose name will be taken in afterwards, but Laodomia's *exemplum* had left no rime to be carried on.

¹² F. 1430, 1433, and 1438; see also F. 1442.

never have called to mind any of those collections, is a characteristic and striking, and even an extreme illustration of a method of work not unusual with him, *i. e.* of entire concentration on few (and in this case just one) of the books known to him.¹³ The cost and rarity of manuscripts may have contributed very largely to the formation of such a habit.

The writer takes pleasure in thanking Professor J. S. P. Tatlock for having called her attention to the possible significance of the order of the *exempla*.

GERMAINE DEMPSTER

Chicago

A B VERSION OF THE LEGEND TOLD BY CHAUCER'S PRIORESS

In a recent brief article in *Modern Language Notes*¹ I presented the text of a previously unknown analogue of Chaucer's *Prioresses Tale*, and suggested that in the very numerous collections of religious tales and sermons which presumably Professor Carleton Brown was not able to take into account when he wrote his excellent *Study of the Miracle of Our Lady Told by Chaucer's Prioress*² there were probably other versions of the story, which might alter our knowledge of its development. Since writing that note, I have come upon another analogue which, though its existence has been pointed out before,³ apparently is unknown to most Chaucerian scholars.

I offer it here, transcribed from a photostat of folios 76v-77r of ms. Brit. Mus. Add. 27336:⁴

¹³ That he should not (except in the case of Lucrece, already so well known to him) have supplemented Jerome's accounts with other sources is less surprising, as so much of Jerome's sources (Plutarch, Xenophon, etc.) was not accessible to him.

¹ "Another Analogue to *The Prioresses Tale*," L, 307 ff.

² Chaucer Society, 2 ser., no. 45; London, 1910.

³ See J. A. Herbert, *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum*, London, 1910, III, 673. The first two volumes of this series were prepared by H. L. D. Ward.

⁴ According to Herbert, p. 660, this manuscript also contains a Latin redaction of the Italian version of Chaucer's *Pardoners Tale* printed in

Fuit quidam iuuenis, suauiſſimus cantor, ad modum ſeculo deditus, qui ad honorem Virginis Marie unum reſponſorium quolibet in feſto eius deuotiſſime decantabat (hoc autem reſponſorium erat ſcilicet Gaude Maria, et cetera), ad cuius ſuauiſſimum cantum magna populj multitudo conueniebat. Hic habitabat in quadam ciuitate ubi ſimiliter multi Iudei morabantur, qui propter honorem quem iſte Virgini exhibebat, ſtimulo inuidie, contra eum fortiſſime ſunt commoti. Vnus ergo Iudeorum, maior in omnibus & formioſior, habuit filium quaſi eiufdem etatis iuuenis predicti. Docebat illum ſub dolo ut iſtum iuuenem ad domum ſuam cauſa ludendi uel comedendi uel aliquid ſimile faciendi ducere procuraret. Quid plura? Aproſinquante ſemel feſto beate Virginis, ne iſte laudes ſolitas decantaret, duxit illum Iudeus ille nequam ſuper ſolarium ſuum & ſtatim amputauit ei caput. Quem cum capite ſic incifo ſub tritici cumulo occultauit. Mane facto, populo⁵ qui ad feſtum venire conſueuerat congregato & coadunato, puer occiſus coram omnibus ſanus & incolumus apparuit, & reſponſorio decantato, populo qui acciderant per ordinem enarrauit & ut hoc crederetur impium,⁶ collo circulus aureus eſt inuentus. Tunc autem conſilium eſt initum ut qui non credunt in Chriſtum & in eius matrem occidantur. & ex hoc multi conuerſi ſunt ad fidem.

According to Herbert,⁷ the ms. from which this tranſcription is taken is a paper quarto of eighty-three leaves written in northern Italy early in the fifteenth century. He ſays that it contains 346 ſhort religious tales "followed by a paragraph on the four cardinal virtues, and by examples of juſtice and liberality, taken chiefly from Auguſtine and Valerius Maximus. . . ."⁸ Herbert's numbering of the ſtories and that of the manuſcript do not agree, however, for 349 appears oppoſite this ſtory in the manuſcript, while according to Herbert it is no. 341. The collection ſeems to have been compiled by a Franciſcan.⁹ The firſt owner was probably one de Baldechimis, a friar.¹⁰

This verſion of the ſtory belongs to Profeſſor Brown's B group.¹¹ The boy does not wander through the Jewiſh ſection of the town; the Jews are angered by a ſong which he ſings as a part of the

Originals and Analogues (Chaucer Society, 1888), p. 131. As this ms. ſeems to date from the early fifteenth century, this redaction probably antedates that in the *Originals and Analogues*, taken from the 1525 edition of the *Cento Nouelle Antiche*, by about a century.

⁵ Ms. has *populus*.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 673.

⁶ Ms. has *impius*.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 647.

⁷ Herbert, *op. cit.*, p. 647.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 673.

¹¹ For a deſcription of the characteristics of the three groups into which moſt of the known verſions of the ſtory fall, ſee Brown, *op. cit.*, pp. 57 ff.

regular religious services; the murdered boy is not found in his grave, but the miracle occurs when he takes his accustomed place in the service. I can find nothing in this version to connect it with any other individual *B* version now known.

Certain details appear here which are not in any of the other versions: the young singer is a bit worldly; the Jew has a son, who makes the acquaintance and presumably wins the friendship of the Christian,¹² the body is hidden under a pile of grain; a golden circle on the neck of the murdered boy proves that the head has actually been cut off. The fact that none of these details appears in any of the other versions suggests that this version of the story is a late one; and as a matter of fact, as has already been said, the manuscript in which it appears was written in the fifteenth century.

WOODBURN O. ROSS

Wayne University

OLD AGE IN CHAUCER'S DAY

In the midst of a very significant article on Chaucerian literary chronology, published thirty years ago, Professor Lowes posed the query: "What, in a word, actually constituted old age in Chaucer's day?"¹ By citations from Pope Innocent III's *De Contemptu*

¹² This boy at once makes one think of the companion of the singer in the *Prioresses Tale*. Professor Brown says, p. 113, "This 'felaw,' who becomes a most important addition to the story, is Chaucer's own creation. We find no hint of his existence in any other version." It is useless with the evidence now in hand to argue that Chaucer had a model in his sources for this second boy. But I should like to point out 1) that here is a hint of a young companion for the singer in one of the other versions, and 2) that in Professor Brown's version C VIII (p. 45) there is also a young Jew, who explains to the Jews the meaning of the song which the Christian boy sings, just as the clergeon's friend explains its meaning to him (Professor Brown notices the similarities of the explanations, p. 114.) The priest of *B v* (Brown, pp. 25 ff) has obviously nothing to do with the case. But if now another version should be found containing some kind of young companion for the singer, it would be possible, I believe, to build an argument for the presence of the companion in Chaucer's source, or sources.

¹ "The Prologue to the Legend of Good Women considered in its Chronological Relations," *PMLA*, xx (1905), pp. 782-85. The point that Lowes

Mundi,² Deschamps' works, the *Pricke of Conscience*, and some other contemporary references, he shows convincingly that the years forty to sixty represented a well established literary convention for old age.³ In view of this, it is of more than passing interest to discover in an English poem of about 1350 a violation of the accepted tradition. The point is of importance because the specific theme of the poem, *The Parlement of the Three Ages*, includes a definite answer to the question posed above.⁴ Youth is thirty years old, middle age, sixty, old age, one hundred. Thus, the author closes his description of the first of the three men who appear before him in his vision (ll. 109-35) with

And he throlly was threuen of thritty 3ere of elde,
And there-to 3onge and 3ape, and 3outhe was his name,
And the semely[est] segge that I segge euer.

The second has reached the conventional limit for Pope Innocent's senility (ll. 136-51); but he is in his successful prime.

Hym semyde, for to see to, of sixty 3ere elde,
And þer-fore men in his marche Medill-elde hym callede.

The third is described with the traditional physical appearance and characteristics of old age (ll. 152-65):

Envyous and angrye, and Elde was his name.
I helde hym be my hapyng a hundrethe 3eris of age

GEORGE R. COFFMAN

University of North Carolina

here makes is that if we date Prologue A of the *Legend* (Skeat edition), 1394, and accept Chaucer's words as autobiographical (A 258-63, 315, 400-401), at about fifty years of age he called himself an old man.

² Bk. i, ch. x, *PL*, ccxvii, col. 706: "Pauci nunc ad xl, paucissimi ad lx annos perveniunt"

³ Apart from the question of the relation of this tradition to contemporary life, the convention, extending to characteristics and physical traits, in the mediaeval literature of Western Europe is largely indebted, I believe, to Pope Innocent's *De Contemptu*. See implication in my "Old Age from Horace to Chaucer," *Speculum* ix (1934), pp. 249-77, esp. 254 ff.

⁴ I Gollancz (ed.), *The Parlement of Three Ages* (Oxford University Press, 1915). See also J. E. Wells, *Manual of Writings in Middle English* (Yale University Press, 1916), pp. 241-43.

ON THE SUBTLY CREEPING WINE OF CHAUCER'S
PARDONER

In his note on line 565 of the *Pardoner's Tale*¹ Skeat discusses with pleasant humor the illegal mixing of wine by vintners; and in a note² on the same line Mr. Manly refers to *Letter Book H*³ where the price of Spanish wine is quoted as lower than that of French wine—which would explain, as Mr. Robinson says,⁴ why Spanish wines “tended to creep subtly in.”

Passages from the *Letters and Papers of John Shillingford*⁵ will probably amuse Chaucer readers as illustrating graphically this habit of mixing poorer wines with better ones. It is true that the episode referred to happened late in the 1440's, but the deceit described could have been nothing new.

In a suit between the Mayor, Bailiffs, and Commonalty of the City of Exeter and the Bishop, Dean, and Chapter of the Cathedral of Exeter, among the many charges brought by the mayor was one that tenants of the bishop had taken corrupt and harmful wine, which should have been thrown out, and shipped it to Bordeaux, to be mixed there with new wine.

It should be said in behalf of the bishop that after his denial, the charge was dropped, for there is no reply to the bishop's reply among the mayor's “Answers, Replications, and Rejoinders.” But, though in this specific case the point was not pressed, there is no reason to doubt the mayor's words as a description of what often happened with bad wine.

¹ *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed Rev. Walter W Skeat, Oxford 1894 the Clarendon Press, v, 281

² *Canterbury Tales by Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed John Matthews Manly, New York 1928. Henry Holt and Company, p 619.

³ *Calendar of Letter-Books . . of the City of London*, ed. R R. Sharpe, London 1907, Letter-book H, p. 145

30 April (*ultimo die Aprilis*), 3 Richard II [A. D 1380], it was ordained . . . that proclamation should be made to the following effect, viz.:

That no wine of Gascony, Rhenish, “Greek,” of Provence or “la Rochele,” be sold for more than 10d. a gallon, no Spanish wine for more than 8d., and no “Malvesie” for more than 16d

⁴ *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed F N. Robinson, Boston 1933. Houghton Mifflin Company, p. 836

⁵ *The Letters and Papers of John Shillingford*, the Camden Society 1871.

These are the passages.⁶

And also ofte tymes hath be founde coriupte wyn not hole for mannys body dampnabill and sholde have be dampned and by way of execucion caste yn the canell . The whiche corrupte wyn hath be carried to Topsham and there y-shipped and so lad to Burdeaux ther to be put and melled amonge nywe wyn as hit shall be well proved yf nede be .
(From Article XI of the Mayor's Articles of Complaint against the Bishop, Dean, and Chapter)

And the saide Bisshop saieth that neither he ne none other by his comaundement never sende s——t wyne ne none other to Topsam ne to Budeux as the saide Mayer most disclaunderly hath surmytted (From Article XI of the Answers of the Bishop, Dean, and Chapter to the Mayor's Articles)

ATCHESON L. HENCH

University of Virginia

A THIRTEENTH-CENTURY CHAUCERIAN ANALOGUE

In so far as Chaucerians have admitted the possibility of a literary source for the pilgrimage framework of the *Canterbury Tales*, the distinction has rested upon the *Novelle* of Giovanni Sercambi, although the historical difficulties in the way of Chaucer's knowledge of the Italian work have precluded more than a partial agreement on this point. And certainly no document would have been needed to supplement the pageant, passing daily under the poet's eye, of the Kentish highway. Nevertheless, it is of interest, and perhaps of some significance, that the theme of story-telling as the pastime of a group of riders had been used, although on a restricted scale, in another piece of pre-Chaucerian fiction which, although Continental in origin, had full opportunity for circulation in England. In this analogue, the riders are, like Chaucer's travellers, bound together by a common religious purpose, although they are not on pilgrimage; and the details with which the single tale involved is presented clearly anticipate certain of Chaucer's devices in narrative technique.

The earliest version of the tale which I have come upon occurs in the *Dialogus Miraculorum* of Caesarius of Heisterbach. The text follows.

De sermone monachi illiterati ad Henricum Cardinalem Albanensem
Sanctae recordationis domnus Henricus Albanensis Episcopus et Cardi-

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 92 and 104-5.

nalis, anno Domini millesimo centesimo octogesimo octavo missus a Clemente Papa temporibus Frederici Imperatoris praedicare crucem in Alemania contra Sarracenos, quosdam sibi monachos terrae nostrae ordinis Cisterciensis socios itineris assumsit. Die quadam cum simul equarent, et ipse diceret in generali. Quis vestrum dicet nobis aliquid boni? respondit unus. Ille, demonstrato quodam monacho laico, cuius nomen excidit. Et praeceptum est ei statim a Cardinale ut verbum proponeret exhortationis. Ille primum se excusans, dicens laicum non debere literatis aliquid loqui, tandem sic exorsus est. Quando mortui fuimus et deducti ad paradisum, occurret nobis sanctus pater noster Benedictus. Visis nobis monachis cucullatis, cum gaudio introducet, viso vero Henrico Episcopo et Cardinale, mirabitur infulatum eum, et dicet: Quis enim es tu? Et ille. Pater, ego sum monachus Cisterciensis. Respondebit sanctus: Nequaquam; monachus corniculatus non est. Tunc Henrico satis pro se allegante, tandem huiusmodi data sententia, dicet ostiarius sanctus Benedictus. Ponite eum supinum, et stomachum eius scindentes aperite. Si inveneritis ibi olera incondita, fabam, pisam, lentem, pultes cibosque regulares, cum monachis intromittatur; sin autem, scilicet pisces grossos et cibos saeculares atque delicatos, foris maneat. Deinde conversus ad Cardinalem, subiecit. Quid illa hora dicturus es, pauper Henrice? Ad quod verbum Cardinalis subridens, sermonem commendavit.¹

Remote though the flat account of Caesarius is from the pulsing vitality of the Canterbury pilgrimage, we yet cannot fail to observe certain points of likeness in narrative structure. We note first that the question of discourse as entertainment for the group of riders is broached in a general preliminary way: "Quis vestrum dicet nobis aliquid boni?" Hereupon one member of the company is called upon by the leader: "Et praeceptum est ei statim a Cardinale ut verbum proponeret exhortationis." It will be recalled that the majority of the Canterbury story-tellers, with the exception of a few irrepressible volunteers, are in one way or another commanded by their temporary dictator to tell their tale. In the second place, the member called upon prefaces his tale with an apologetic disclaimer: "Ille primum se excusans, dicens laicum non debere literatis aliquid loqui." This gesture, again, is characteristic of a number of the Canterbury pilgrims, who on various grounds seek to disavow any special fitness for their task. In particular, the apologia of the humble parson, putting himself under correction by the brotherhood of learned clerks as one who is "nat textuel," somewhat parallels the illiterate monk's expression of re-

¹ Ed. J. Strange, Coloniae, Bonnae et Bruxellis, 1851, I, 246-7.

luctance to address the learned² Again, the story that is told reflects directly and discredibly upon another member of the company. It is true that the rebuke administered by the unlettered monk is a somewhat pale foreshadowing of the rowdy persiflage exchanged by the Friar and Summoner, but the direction of the narrative curve is the same. Finally, as frequently in the *Tales*, the reaction of the traveller at whom the satiric tale was aimed is noted. Cardinal Henricus—superior in self-control to the ecclesiastics of the Pilgrimage—"subridens, sermonem commendavit."

In brief, then, this exemplum recorded by Caesarius, though weak in narrative artistry, does present in miniature the structural device through which the tales of the Canterbury pilgrims are inset into the framework of the journey. In fact, the picture of an ecclesiastic come to judgment might, if translated into Chaucer's lively idiom, have been substituted for the Summoner's picture of the after-life of friars, had the poet been minded to deal as harshly with the monastic as with the mendicant orders. And, indeed, the pilgrim monk and the Cardinal Henricus have much in common. The latter is in a position of high ecclesiastical authority; the former is described by Chaucer as "A manly man, to ben an abbot able," and by the Host as "governour wily and wys." Both are fond of good living and gay apparel; and Henricus by implication is as neglectful as was Chaucer's monk of the rule

"of seint Beneyt
Bycause that it was old and somdel streit"

These similarities, if they occurred apart from their setting, would not be noteworthy; as it is, the description of the same type of worldly churchman in the exemplum and in the *Tales* supplements the likeness in narrative convention.

² In much the same vein, the Franklin anticipates possible criticism from his audience on the ground of his uncultivated speech: "bycause I am a burel man / At my bygynnyng first I yow biseche / Have me excused of my rude speche" So too the Squire: "I dar not undertake so heigh a thyng / Myn Englissh eek is insufficient." It will be recalled also that Chaucer in his rôle of pilgrim declares himself like the Parson to be giving a free rather than scholarly rendering of his material, although he does not plead illiteracy as his reason. The Monk, the Man-of-Law, and the Miller all likewise defend themselves in advance against hypothetical criticism. Chaucer, like the author of the exemplum, has transferred to his fictitious characters the literary convention of the author's apology.

The anecdote related by Caesarius is, then, in outline a rough vignette of the type of situation developed with finished artistry in the *Canterbury Tales*. That the story circulated in fourteenth-century England need hardly be questioned, in view of the wide use made of Caesarius' exempla. Specific testimony is, however, available in the fact that it was taken over, with little change except the omission of certain details, into the fifteenth-century collection of anecdotes known as the *Alphabet of Tales*.³ It is not, of course, necessary to assume that Chaucer knew precisely this exemplum, but the fact that it employs a narrative situation anticipating his own structural device should be taken into account in reconstructing the background of the *Canterbury Tales* in popular fiction.

BEATRICE DAW BROWN

Upper Montclair, New Jersey

AN UNCOLLECTED SIXTEENTH-CENTURY ALLUSION TO *THE HOUSE OF FAME*

The following important allusion to Chaucer's *House of Fame*, although noticed by historians,¹ has evidently eluded Miss Spur-

³ EETS 126, p. 241. This version runs as follows

Gula Religiosos Aliquando Decipit

Cesarius tellis how som tyme þer was a monk of Ceustus order, and hym happend be made a bisshopp, and afterward a cardinall. So on a tyme hym happend to ride, & emang all þe felaship þat was with hym he spak vnto a monk þat was bod lightlie letterd, & said, "Tell vs now some gude wurd or som gud tale as we ride." And he excusid hym faste, & said he cuthe nott, & be no mene cuthe he gytt excusid. So at þe laste he began at tell, & said vnto þis cardynall; "When we shall be dead & broght into paradise, þan sall Saynt Benett com & take vs in þat er cullid, with grete ioy & myrth. And þan he sall speke vnto þe, þat is a bisshop & a cardynall, & say 'What ert þou?' And þou sall ansswer agayn & say, 'fiathur, I am a monk of Ceustus ordur.' And he [sall say], 'Nay, þat ert þou nott, ffor a monke is not so gaylie arayed as þou erte.' And þan þou sall alege many thyngis for þe. And þan sall Saynt Benett giff a sentence, & bid þe porters oppyn þi bodeye & luke what at þai fynd þer-in, 'and if ye fynd þar cale & peas & benys, & no noder meatt, latt hym com in with þe monkis: & if ye fynde þerin grete flissh or delicatt meatis, lat hym stand þeroute.' What may þou þan say, þat now faris so wele, and we far so ill?" So þis Cardinall smylid & commendid hym for his gude tale.

¹ Allusion to the allusion in *D. N. B.* (art. Robert Catlin); quoted by

geon's collection ² and subsequent recordings of Chaucer allusions.

As for them that seek fame by Treason, and by procuring the destruction of Princes, where shall sound that fame? Shall the golden trump of Fame and Good Report, that Chaucer speaketh of? No, but the black Trump of Shame shall blow out their infamy for ever ³

This allusion appears in a lengthy speech made by Chief Justice Robert Catlin on February 9, 1571, in pronouncing judgment against Robert Hickford who had on the same day pleaded guilty of participating in the treason of his master the Duke of Norfolk. Obviously Catlin is referring to the "Clere Laude" of line 1575,⁴ which is described as golden in line 1678; and also to "Sklaundre" of line 1580, which is described as black in line 1637.

Of the seven known allusions to the *House of Fame* before 1571,⁵ only the one credited to Lydgate refers to the golden trump, and the contrasted clarion is not mentioned at all. A comparison of these eight allusions points to the fact that Robert Catlin in his extempore speech reveals the closest familiarity with the poem and makes the most apposite and the most outstanding application.

H. C. WHITFORD

New York

Edward Foss, *The Judges of England*, London, 1857, v: 473, whose source is Howell.

² *Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion, 1357-1900*, Cambridge, 1925.

³ T. B. Howell, *A Complete Collection of State Trials and Proceedings for High Treason and other Crimes and Misdemeanours . . .* London, 1816, i: 1050. Howell prints the complete trial from Ms. Brit. Mus 1427 which had already been catalogued by Samuel Ayscough in his *Catalogue of the Manuscripts Preserved in The British Museum Hitherto Undescribed*, London, 1782, i. 299. E. J. L. Scott's *Index to the Sloane Manuscripts in the British Museum . . .* London, 1904, also records this manuscript on p. 254 and gives the folio numbers 82-86.

⁴ The line references follow F. N. Robinson, *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, Cambridge, 1933.

⁵ Six are recorded in Miss Spurgeon's first volume: Lydgate (1439), p. 44; Caxton (c 1483), p. 61; Hawes (1506), p. 67; Pynson (1526), strictly not an allusion, p. 75, Anon. (c. 1540), p. 83; and Baldwin [1561], p. 95-6. The seventh allusion, from Gerald Legh (1562), is printed in *Notes and Queries*, CLIX: 367.

SIR LEWIS CLIFFORD'S FRENCH MISSION OF 1391

Any new information concerning Sir Lewis Clifford is likely to meet with interest from the student of English because of Clifford's friendship with Geoffrey Chaucer.¹ Accordingly, it may be noted that H. Moranville² has printed a French official document³ which affords data omitted in Froissart's account of Sir Lewis Clifford's mission in 1391 to Paris.⁴

This official document, not hitherto noted in this connection, recounts in some detail the agreements drawn up by the French and English commissioners respecting the treaty for peace, and relates besides the arrangements decided upon for a personal interview between the two respective sovereigns. The conclusion reached was that Charles VI should attend on "le jour de la Nativité Saint Jehan Bapteste prochainement . . . à Bouloigne ou à Saint Omer, et le Roy d'Engleterre à Calais."⁵ This statement is not without significance, since it would appear to supersede the authority of Froissart, who reports that the conference was to be at Amiens.⁶

Two formal differences, moreover, appear between this record and the account in Froissart. First, Froissart states that the English commissioners "apportoient lettres de creance au roy et au duc de Berry et au duc de Bourgoigne";⁷ but the French document mentions by name only the "duc de Bourbonnois." Secondly, Froissart includes Robert Bricquet as a third member of the English embassy; but the official writ refers explicitly to only two ambassadors, Thomas de Percy and "Loys" Clifford.⁸

There is also the question as to the date of the meeting, which Froissart places as "vers la Chandeleur" (February, 1391). Now, the historian Wallon, in commenting on this passage, says: "C'est

¹ G. L. Kittredge, "Chaucer and Some of His Friends," *MP*, I (1903), 1-18.

² *Bibl. de l'École des Chartes*, L (1889), 355-67, -380.

³ *Bibl. nat.*, Dupuy 306, fol. 83 R^o.

⁴ *Œuvres de Froissart, Chroniques* (ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove), XIV, 284, 288, 335.

⁵ *Bibl. de l'École des Chartes*, L, 370.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, XIV, 284.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ *Bibl. de l'École des Chartes*, L, 370.

un peu trop."⁹ But in this case it appears that Froissart is more nearly correct, for in the document the date of the conference is fixed as February 24, 1391.

It remains to be noted that since Clifford and his associates have attached their testimonial seals to the record of deliberations, this French writ takes precedence by its official character over Froissart as a source for facts about Clifford's mission. Moreover, inasmuch as Clifford knew Deschamps,¹⁰ information coming to light about the activities of Sir Lewis in France is not without point. In fact, Professor Lowes¹¹ has singled out among other occasions the year 1391 as a likely opportunity for communications through Sir Lewis between Deschamps and Chaucer.

HALDEEN BRADDY

*State Teachers College,
Alpine, Texas*

A NOTE ON THE HELM IN BEOWULF

Thanks to the excavations recently made in Sweden, it is now possible more accurately to interpret at least two of the heretofore obscure passages in Beowulf. Both deal with the helm and their elucidation has been problematic because of the paucity of finds to which to refer them.

1448 ac se hwita helm hafelan werede
sē ðe meregrundas mengan scolde
sēcan sundgeblad since geweorðad
befongen frēawrāsnum swā hine fyrndagum. . . .

The meaning of frēawrāsnum has engaged the ingenuity of lexicographers but the application of their results does not give a clear picture of the object which the poet wished to represent. Bosworth-Toller translates the passage under the word Freawrasen (which is defined "A noble or royal chain, a diadem") thus: "the bright helm guarded his head ornamented with treasure,

⁹ H. Wallon, *Richard II* (Paris, 1864), II, 412 f., cf. 44 f.

¹⁰ Deschamps sent some of his poems to Chaucer by the hand of Sir Lewis. See *Chaucer's Complete Works* (ed. with intro. and notes by F. N. Robinson, New York, 1933), p. xxiii.

¹¹ "The Prologue to the 'Legend of Good Women' . . .," *PMLA.*, xx (1905), 769.

encircled with noble chains." Clark-Hall (citing this passage) "frēa wrāsn: f. splendid chain." Grein-Holthausen-Kohler Sprachschatz "frēa-wrāsn. f. diadema?" Klaeber Beowulf: 'frēa-wrāsn f. (lordly i. e.) splendid chain or band." Wyatt-Chambers Beowulf: "frēa-wrāsn, st. f. lordly chain (diadem surrounding the helmet)." None of these gives any notion of the use or appearance of the object described and the definitions are apparently composed from the separate meanings of the two parts of the compound.

The finds at Valsgarde in Old Uppsala parish¹ include three helmets from graves 5, 6 and 7 of which the one known as Valsgarde 6 is of the greatest present interest. This is unique in that it is possessed of a cheek- and neck-guard of mail. As worn, this was cylindrical in form and tapered back from a depth of some thirty-four rows of rings in front to about one half that number behind, forming a sort of truncated camail. It was attached to the lower rim of the casque and to the ocularia by an iron wire but was not, apparently, attached to the nasal. The iron bands of which the helmet proper is constructed were ornamented with repoussé sheets of bronze with interlace patterns showing animal motifs and some, if not all, of these plates were covered with a white metal. The poet's descriptive terms are thus seen to be accurate. The boar's likeness which is found on the familiar Benty Grange example is not present, but the longitudinal ridge or comb over the helmet has animal-head finials. Miss Arwidsson dates Valsgarde 6 between 675 and 700.

Valsgarde 5 which has also been reconstructed is of a quite different pattern, having five hanging and hinged strips of metal to protect the neck.

A hitherto unnoticed characteristic of the well-known helmet Vendel XII² is brought to light by comparison with Valsgarde 6. It has a notched tube of metal around the rim into whose notches the rings of the neck- and cheek-protection fitted, being secured by a wire which was run through the channel. Fragments of the mail were found with the helmet.

¹ See Sune Lindqvist, "Vendel-time Finds from Valsgarde," *Acta Archaeologica*, vol. 3 (1932), p. 21 ff. and Greta Arwidsson, "A New Scandinavian Form of Helmet from the Vendel-time," *A. A.* vol. 5 (1935), p. 243 ff.

² See cut in Stolpe and Arne, "Gräffaltet vid Vendel" (or in the French version, *La Necropole de Vendel*) Plate XXXVI.

This serves to illuminate

1030 ymb þæs helmes hrōf hēafod-beorge
 wirum bewunden wala ūtan hēold
 þæt him fēla lāf frēne ne meahton
 scūrheard sceþþan. . . .

Wala has given as much trouble as frēawrāsn. Random examples: Wyatt-Chambers Beowulf: Wala, w. m. wale, "wreath" (in heraldry), the projecting rim or roll on the outside of the helmet (Skeat); . . . round the helmet's crown the "wreath" wound with wires gave protection from the outside . . . Cf. Goth. walus. Klaeber Beowulf: Wala: wk m (or mu.?) rounded projection on helmet, rim, roll; . . . Cp. walu "mark of blow, ridge, wale; Go. walus "staff." Grein-Holthausen-Kohler Sprachschatz: wala m (walu f?) (got. walus) Bugel, Wulst; ein Teil des Helmes; B1031.

Both "befongen" and "wirum bewunden" suggest the attachment of a separate component to the helm and I take "frea-wrasn" to mean splendid mail-protection and "wala" to mean the camail as well, the former being perhaps an elliptic or poetic synonym for the latter. At any rate, the poet here seems to be describing something which he knows about and, it may be, emphasizing the evidently exceptional adjunct protection as a particularly opulent detail.

STEPHEN J. HERBEN, JR.

Bryn Mawr College

BROW OR BRAWN?

Schalke3 to schote at hym schowen to þenne,
 Haled to hym of her arewe3, hitten hym oft,
 Bot þe poynte3 payred at þe pyth þat py3t in his schelde3,
 And þe barbe3 of his browe bite non wolde,
 Þa3 þe schauen schaft schyndered in pece3;
 Þe hede hypped a3ayn were-so-euer hit hytte.
 Bot quen þe dynte3 hym dered of her dry3e stroke3,
 þen, braynwod for bate, on burne3 he rase3.

(*Sir Gaw. & the Green Knt.* 1454-61)

Tolkien-Gordon (ed. of 1930) emend Ms. *browe* 1457 (< OE.

brú or ON. *brún*) to *browen*, a variant spelling for *brawen* (< OF. *brao(u)n*), "boar's flesh": *ow* for *aw* being elsewhere exemplified in the Ms. The emendation destroys the vivid little picture that the poet has painted.

The wild boar that stands angrily facing hounds and hunters is in its full winter coat with its outer covering of stiff, thick bristles. Above the eye-brows the bristles are noticeably thicker, and increase in size and density until the forehead, top of the head, and nape, the withers and the upper portion of the back are covered by a coarse blackish-gray mane. So heavy and thick are the brow-bristles, that when they diminish with the shedding of the winter-coat, the facial appearance of the animal is changed. Their toughness is instrumental in protecting the small deep-set eyes as he moves through thickets of dead underbrush. In his rage the beast has erected the bristles of the aforesaid mane, so that he appears a handbreadth larger than he actually is, thus increasing the archers' chances of a bad shot by causing the arrows to strike above the mark they are aiming at. Furthermore, the thick stubbly growth of the brow-bristles turns the arrows: shafts are splintered, arrow-heads bound back.

At bay the boar now faces his opponents, and probably his flanks are protected by undergrowth and bushes (the animal loves to face his foes from a thicket). His position, therefore, forbids a broad-side or three-quarters shot, and of three vital ones only the head-shot—between the eyes into the brain—remains.¹ Consequently arrows aimed for the head-shot rattle against and spring back from the brow, or stick ineffectively in the "shields" (tough tissue under the shoulders, made tougher by the animal's habit of rubbing the shoulders, after a mud-bath, against the resin on a pine trunk). The author wrote "brow" and not "brawn," because he meant "brow."²

The *Gawain*-poet had doubtless seen many a crusty old boar

¹ In the phrase *braymood for bate*, 1461, there is a slight suggestion, though one not capable of proof, that the boar is maddened by shots lighting on the head.

² All information about the boar's habits comes from the following: (1) *Manuel de Vénérerie française*, Cte. Le Couteulx de Canteleu, Paris, 1890, pp. 198-201; (2) *Das Schwarzwild*, K. Sneathlage, Berlin, 1934, pp. 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 177-79; (3) *Farbige Tierbilder* No. 39, W. Kuhnert & O. Grassmann, Berlin, n. d.

"bide the bay." His vignette stands out sharply because he knew whereof he spoke. To improve upon it is as dangerous as approaching the boar.

HENRY L. SAVAGE

Princeton University

BANDELLO AND "CLIZIA"

Adequate attention has never been directed to the relationship between Bandello and Cavaliere Gerardo (or Gherardo) Boldieri, who adopted the feminine pseudonym of "Clizia,"¹ and was the author of a poem about Romeo and Juliet, based on the famous *novella* of Luigi da Porto. Even Letterio di Francia, who has made a most valuable and thoroughgoing investigation of Bandello's sources,² not only does not refer to the novelliere's obligations to Clizia, but by implication actually denies their existence.³

Before discussing the specific evidence for a literary relationship between Bandello and Clizia,⁴ it is perhaps advisable to reappraise somewhat the documentary value of the confessions of obligations to the Boldieri family which Bandello repeatedly makes in his prefaces. Letterio di Francia dismisses such acknowledgment as the "consueto artificio bandelliano, per dissimulare la derivazione da un' opera scritta. . . ."⁵ He cites as a typical example the introduction to the tale of Romeo and Giulietta, where Bandello, in order to divert attention from the fact that his *novella* was plagiarized from Luigi da Porto, pretends that it was related by

¹ Giuseppe Chiarini, *Studi Shakespeariani*, Leghorn, 1896, p. 237, Gioachino Brognoligo, "Il Poemetto di Clizia Veronese," in *Il Propugnatore*, nuova serie, xxvi (1893), part II, 390; Guido Leati, *Di Giulietta e Romeo*, Spoleto, 1897, p. 13.

² Letterio di Francia, "Alla scoperta del vero Bandello," in *GSLLI*, LXXVIII (1921), 290-324, LXXX (1922), 1-94; LXXXI (1923), 1-75, "Otto anni dopo," in *GSLLI*, XCIII (1929), 106-117.

³ "Per tutto il resto, il nostro A. non si allontana dal testo originario, tranne nella forma; . . ." Letterio di Francia, *op. cit.*, LXXXI (1923), 5. G. Brognoligo also denies a connection between the versions of Clizia and of Bandello, *Studi di storia letteraria*, Rome-Milan, 1904, p. 76.

⁴ Clizia: *L'infelice Amore de' due fedelissimi amanti Giulia e Romeo scritto in ottava rima da Clizia, nobile veronese ad Ardeo suo*. In Alessandro Torri's *Giulietta e Romeo*, Pisa, 1831, pp. 149-193.

⁵ *GSLLI*, LXXXI (1923), 3.

"Captain Alessandro Peregrino."⁶ Nevertheless, Bandello's mythical Peregrino, army captain, and tale-teller extraordinary, resembles tremendously the Veronese archer Pellegrino, who is the supposed narrator of Luigi da Porto's *Gulietta e Romeo*. Consequently, Bandello's foreword, precisely because of its crudity, has a certain significance, in that it helps to establish the very literary source which he attempts to conceal.

In the light of this circumstance, perhaps we may review with renewed curiosity the references which Bandello makes to the Boldieri family. In the second part of his collection of tales, Bandello dedicates Novella XII to Gherardo Boldieri, in these words: "Il Bandello Al molto magnifico messer Gherardo Boldero salute."⁷ Still more interesting is the fact that Bandello is the author of two different versions of the Romeo and Juliet story, both of which are closely associated with the name of Boldieri. The most famous of these versions is entitled *La sfortunata morte di due infelicissimi amanti che l'uno di veleno e l'altro di dolore morirono, con vari accidenti*,⁸ being a *novella* which is supposedly narrated in the house of Messer Matteo Boldieri, uncle of Gherardo Boldieri.⁹ The other version concerns a certain Gerardo, who married Elena, after rescuing her from the tomb.¹⁰ The narration of this tale is directly inspired, according to the author, by *una pietosa novella* related a short time earlier by the "magnifico messer Gerardo Boldiero il cavaliere."¹¹

It is now time to examine the main question: Did Bandello, in publishing his *novelle* in 1554, adopt some of the innovations which had appeared the year before in the poem of his friend Clizia? Of such innovations, the most important concern the duel between Romeo and Tebaldo, the psychology of the heroine, and

⁶ *Ibid.*, 2

⁷ Matteo Bandello, *op. cit.*, II, Part II, Novella XII, 433. Cf. G. Brognoligo, "Il Poemetto di Clizia Veronese," 402.

⁸ Matteo Bandello, *op. cit.*, II, 370-408. Cf. Giuseppe Chiarini, *op. cit.*, 237. G. Brognoligo, in an argument based solely on the authority of Bandello's preface, attempts to date the actual composition of this tale before 1541, *Studi di storia letteraria*, 76.

⁹ Bandello, *op. cit.*, II, 369, 370.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, Part II, Novella XLII, III, 405-432. See Letterio di Francia, *op. cit.*, LXXX (1923), 30.

¹¹ Bandello, *op. cit.*, III, 403.

the character of the friar. It will be recalled that according to Luigi da Porto, the battle between Romeo and Tebaldo begins as a general brawl, in which the Montecchi and the Cappelletti appear equally at fault.¹² The *mêlée* has narrowed down to a few individual hand-to-hand fights when Romeo, infuriated at the defeat of his comrades, impetuously assails Tebaldo, and kills him.

Clizia has the *mêlée* start with a deliberate attack by the Cappelletti on the Montecchi:

Dico ch'un di Tebaldo, ardito e forte
Giovin de' Cappelletti, in compagnia
Di molti altri, assalì presso alle porte
Dei Borsari il gentil Romeo per via, . . .¹³

It will be observed that in this passage Romeo is not alone, but is the leader of the Montecchi forces, just as Tebaldo is "in compagnia di molti altri." Romeo's followers are specifically mentioned in the second stanza below:

Eran già i suoi dalle ferite tutti
Tinti di sangue; . . .¹⁴

At this stage of the combat, Romeo makes a vindictive attack upon the Cappelletti, exactly as in Luigi da Porto's version. However, for the hand-to-hand battle between Tebaldo and Romeo, which occurs only at the very end of the *mêlée*, Clizia again introduces a new version.¹⁵ His Romeo endeavors for Giulia's sake to spare Tebaldo. So vicious is the attack of the Cappelletti leader, nevertheless, that Romeo is compelled to kill him in order to save his own life.¹⁶

¹² Gino Chiarini, *Romeo e Giulietta, La Storia degli amanti veronesi nelle novelle italiane e nella tragedia di Shakespeare*, Florence, 1906, 14. "E così stando, intervenne che la fortuna . . . non so qual malvagio seme spargendo, fece tra le loro case la già quasi morta nimistà rinverdire, . . ."

¹³ Clizia, II, stanza 24.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, stanza 26.

¹⁵ Fuggita la vil turba e quasi spenta,
Tra i padron si ridusse la battaglia—*Ibid.*, II, 27

¹⁶ Tutto schiumoso il fier Tebaldo tenta
Di mille solo un colpo far che vaglia:
Fa l'amor della moglie a Romeo lenta
La man, ma sì 'l nimico lo travaglia,
Che al fin per dar a se medesima aita
Con una punta a lui tolse la vita.—*Ibid.*

Bandello, while following in the main da Porto's account of the duel, agrees with his friend Clizia in the following essential respects: (a) He makes the Cappelletti definitely the aggressors in the *mêlée*; ¹⁷ (b) his Romeo fights Tebaldo in self-defence, and not for revenge, as in da Porto's *novella*.¹⁸ The self-defence motive introduced by Clizia survives through the versions of Boastuau and Brooke down to Shakespeare, who restores the revenge motive of Luigi da Porto.

Further possible confirmation of Bandello's indebtedness to Clizia is afforded by a detail of localization. According to Luigi da Porto, the battle between Romeo and Tebaldo begins in the "via del corso."¹⁹ Clizia, more precisely, has the struggle take place "alle porte dei Borsari," at the west end of the Corso dei Borsari. Bandello, following Clizia, says: "... su il Corso vicino a la porta dei Borsari verso Castelvecchio."²⁰

Clizia modifies also the monologue in *Giulietta e Romeo* where the heroine, in a soliloquy, wavers between two thoughts. First she believes that Romeo does not really love her, but seeks to humiliate her for revenge against the Cappelletti family. Then, without transition, she takes comfort in another idea, that perhaps by marrying Romeo she can bring about a reconciliation between the rival families.²¹

Boldieri attempts to explain logically Giulia's sudden change of heart. He represents her as repenting because she cannot believe that a fair countenance can hide a villainous heart;²² an explanation which apparently proved entirely acceptable to Bandello.²³

Clizia's effort to make the character of Giulia more natural, and perhaps more feminine, is especially manifest in his account of the heroine's conduct after the death of her kinsman Tebaldo. At this stage of the narrative, the Giulietta of Luigi da Porto weeps

¹⁷ "... molti di quelli dei Cappelletti incontrarono alcuni dei Montecchi e con l'arme fieramente gli assalirono." Bandello, *op. cit.*, II, 382.

¹⁸ "... venne Tebaldo per traverso e diede una gagliarda stoccata a Romeo in un fianco . . ." *Ibid.*, II, 383

¹⁹ G. Chiarini, *op. cit.*, 14.

²⁰ Bandello, *op. cit.*, II, 382.

²¹ Luigi da Porto, *op. cit.*, pp 8-9.

²² Chè non le par che inganno o indegno affetto
Possa capir sotto sì dolce aspetto.—Clizia, I, 42.

²³ Bandello, II, 376-377.

copiously, without alleging any reasons for her tears. Against the cajoling and menacing of her parents, she preserves the most obstinate and heroic silence. Clizia's Giulia tries to escape the parental inquisition by inventing a plausible pretext for her laments: her pretended grief for the death of Tebaldo. So convincingly does she lie, that she soon makes an ally of her mother, who in turn wins over Antonio Cappelletti.²⁴

Here again Bandello apparently attempts a fusion of the versions of da Porto and of Clizia. Following da Porto, he has Giulietta unable at first to explain the cause of her melancholy.²⁵ Then suddenly the heroine begins to talk like the Giulia of Clizia, and to hint that her depressed spirits are somehow associated with the death of her cousin.²⁶ As if to confirm this supposition, Bandello has the servants also suggest a connection between Giulietta's grief and the killing of Tebaldo.²⁷ Furthermore, Bandello, apparently following Clizia rather than da Porto, makes Madonna Giovanna Cappelletti suppose at first that Giulietta's sorrow is caused by the loss of her cousin.²⁸

In da Porto's *novella*, Giulietta is able to go to the confessional the first time unaccompanied by Madonna Giovanna, who is not even introduced until after the secret marriage of her daughter to Romeo.²⁹ In the versions of Clizia and of Bandello, the mother

²⁴ Ma, perchè il sempre lagrimar scemava
Più a Giulia le beltà di giorno in giorno,
Che del morto cugino si scusava
Vedersi il tristo spirito intorno; . . . —Clizia, II, 41.
Se lei il morto Tebaldo attristi, o segno
Di qualche suo desir sia che l'affanni,
Non so; . . . —*Ibid.*, II, 43.

²⁵ "Madre mia cara, io non so né posso immaginarmi onde sia nasciuta questa mia malinconia. . . ." —Bandello, *op. cit.*, II, 389. Cf. Luigi da Porto, *op. cit.*, p. 20

²⁶ ". . . perchè dappoi che Tebaldo fu morto non ho potuto rallegrarmi. . . ." —Bandello, *op. cit.*, II, 389. Cf. Clizia, II, stanza 41.

²⁷ "Tutti quei di casa altro non sapevano che dire se non che Giulietta dopo la morte del cugino sempre era stata di malissima voglia e che non cessava mai di piangere. . . ." —Bandello, *op. cit.*, II, 388.

²⁸ "La madre . . . dicendole . . . che pur troppo la morte del suo cugino pianto aveva." —*Ibid.*, II, 386. Cf. Clizia's "Se lei il morto Tebaldo attristi, . . ." (II, 43).

²⁹ Luigi da Porto, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

accompanies her daughter to the confessional the first as well as the second time.⁸⁰

In language, Bandello is also closer to Clizia than to da Porto for his description of the wedding. Da Porto says simply that in the presence of the friar "per parola di presente la bella giovane sposò."⁸¹ Clizia retains the significant word *presente*, and goes on to specify that the Christian ritual was followed, and that Romeo placed the ring upon Giulietta's finger.⁸² Bandello drifts so far from the original of da Porto that he omits the words *di presente* altogether, but follows closely the phrasing of Clizia.⁸³ Moreover, Bandello, like Clizia, indulges in a series of rhetorical questions to describe the wedded bliss of the young couple.⁸⁴

In no respect do the versions of Clizia and da Porto differ more than in their endings. The novelliere, inspired by Ovid, relates at length the pathetic death of the lovers, after their discovery by Frate Lorenzo. The friar is arrested, under suspicion of necromancy and of grave-robbing.⁸⁵ Summoned before Bartolomeo della Scala, the ruler of Verona, he makes a miserable defence of himself, alleging at first that he entered Giulietta's tomb to pray for her soul, not to rob her grave.⁸⁶ Unfortunately, some of Frate Lorenzo's numerous enemies in the priesthood open the vault and find the dead body of Romeo.⁸⁷ To explain this discovery, Frate Lorenzo is obliged to admit that he has lied, and on bended knee to plead as his only excuse that his intentions were excellent. The pathetic figure of this churchman, suspected of sinister relations with Romeo Montecchi and of possible necromancy and grave-rob-

⁸⁰ Clizia, II, 9; Bandello, *op. cit.*, II, 381.

⁸¹ Luigi da Porto, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

⁸² Romeo seguendo la cristiana norma,
Come si suol con assentir presente,
Or quella il dito d'aureo cerchio informa, . . . —Clizia, II, 17.

⁸³ "Messer lo frate . . . dette quelle parole che si costumano secondo l'ordine de la Chiesa dir nei spozalizi, Romeo diede l'anello a la sua cara Giulietta con grandissimo piacere di tutti dui. . . ."—Bandello, *op. cit.*, II, 381.

⁸⁴ Clizia, II, 21; Bandello, *op. cit.*, II, 382

⁸⁵ "Fareste forse qualche malla sopra questo sepolcro? . . ."—Luigi da Porto, *op. cit.*, p. 37 " . . . dicono gli sciocchi che io per ispogliar morti era ivi andato."—*Ibid.*, p. 38.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

bing, is in keeping with the traditions of Boccaccio and of Masuccio.³⁸

It would almost seem that Clizia and his Dominican friend Bandello had entered into an agreement to put into a more favorable light the relations of Romeo and his Franciscan friend, Frate Lorenzo. According to Clizia, the friar, whose name is altered to Batto Tricastro, arrives after the death of both Romeo and of Giulia, and the account of his arrest and public questioning is omitted entirely. Batto Tricastro's relations with Romeo are described as intimate, but not necessarily improper.³⁹ Bandello says specifically that not only were Frate Lorenzo's relations with Romeo correct, but also that they did not differ from those existing between the friar and numerous other young gentlemen of the country.⁴⁰ Like Clizia, Bandello omits da Porto's charges against the friar of necromancy and of grave-robbing, and also the account of his humiliating public confession.⁴¹

Clizia was the first poet to deal with the legend of Romeo and Juliet. The tendency towards a lyrical treatment of this theme may be said to have its beginnings in his *ottava rima*. But *prima-facie* evidence indicates that Clizia's most important influence was exerted upon the celebrated prose writer, Matteo Bandello. This influence apparently is most manifest in the analysis of the psychology of the hero and of the heroine, and in the favorable treatment of the character of the friar.

OLIN H. MOORE

The Ohio State University

³⁸ "Il frate . . . a Romeo niuna cosa avrebbe senza suo gran danno potuta negare. . . ."—*Ibid.*, p. 12. Cf *Il Decamerone di Messer Giovanni Boccaccio*, ed. Pietro Fanfani, Florence, 1904, I, 277, etc. (III, viii), *Il Novellino di Masuccio Salernitano*, ed. Luigi Settembrini, Naples, 1874, p. 359, etc.

³⁹ E perchè in nodo d'amicizia stretto
E seco, si dispon di contentarlo; . . . —Clizia, I, 66
E Iddio sa quanto è ver voi l'obbligo mio.—*Ibid.*, I, 67

⁴⁰ Bandello, *op. cit.*, II, 379.

⁴¹ See my article on "le Rôle de Boastuaan dans le développement de la légende de Roméo et Juliette," in *Revue de littérature comparée*, IX (1929), 638-642.

THE CONQUEROR IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY FRENCH DRAMA

Seventeenth-century French writing generally upholds hereditary monarchy as the rule of Providence: a king by succession comes into a legacy God has vested and tradition has maintained in his family. Any move by which those born to obey dominate one destined to command is a paradox and a sacrilege. The drama concurs in proclaiming the birthright of accredited sovereigns. In an early play a king asserted himself to be

vn à qui la naissance
A donné des rayons d'une divine essence.¹

During the Fronde a usurper acknowledged the inviolability of kingship,

Un roi, quoique vaincu, garde son caractère . . .
Au moment qu'il paroît, les plus grands conquérants,
Pour vertueux qu'ils soient, ne sont que des tyrans.²

For all its hedging of sovereignty, however, the theater permitted encroachment and produced intruders who were to be judged by their performances. In the era when "l'idée qu'on avait de la royauté mettait hors de toute mesure la personne royale,"³ the drama cited alien standards,

. . . les sceptres sont faits pour qui peut les gagner . . .
Monter par sa valeur à ce degré suprême,
C'est savoir acheter l'éclat du diadème . . . ,⁴

Adventure in high places was not novel to the French theater. Antiquity gave few tokens of the stability of kings or the permanence of a sovereign family. For the dramatists of the Renaissance "les royautez sont choses passagères,"⁵ sovereignty "une vaine

¹ Mairet, *Chryséide et Armand* (1625), v, 3. Cf. J. de Schelandre, *Tyr et Sidon* (1608), I, 5.

² Corneille, *Pertharite* (1651), v, 2.

³ D Nisard, *Histoire de la Littérature française*, Paris, Firmin-Didot, 1881, II, 389; cf P Hazard, *La Crise de la Conscience européenne*, Paris, Boivin, 1935, II, 45-46.

⁴ Montfleury, *Trasibule* (1663), I, 3. For the period preceding cf. Du Ryer, *Alcione*, ed Lancaster, Baltimore, 1930, v 15

⁵ Garnier, *les Juives*, III.

apparence que le moindre hazard peut ravir,"⁶ witness the defeat of a king Saul⁷ and the sway of a Nebuchadnezzar, "sorti de la fange d'un peuple."⁸ Seventeenth-century dramatists were similarly impressed by the accessibility of ancient thrones: here, "Le parricide a fait la moitié de nos rois";⁹ there, "Il est des rois . . . dont le peuple est le suprême arbitre";¹⁰ Narcissus and Pallas appointed and dismissed kings;¹¹ Alexander allotted the scepters of Asia among his subalterns.¹² Zeal for erudition and fancy for audacity tempering caution, the philosophy of lèse-majesté becomes a veritable school for kings.

One of the earliest self-made kings of the XVIIth century repertory is a client-prince of the Roman Empire, whose success is his vindication,

. . . son regne assuré
Sans le vouloir exprès de là-haut n'eust duré.¹³

While praising Herod's accomplishment, however, Hardy scored his method, his subordination to Rome and all the inadequacies of the man "Presque de la charue au trône parvenu." In Tristan's *Mariane* (1636) Herod perfects his technique. The schemes which suppressed competitors become a campaign which "soumettoit les Roys" (I, 3). The indebtedness to Rome is redeemed by deference to Augustus (*id.*). Boastfulness is further mitigated by expressions of gratitude (*id.*). Ultimately, when he proposes to answer Mariamne's accusations

d'un air qui fera foy
Qu'on ne doit pas manquer de respect à son Roy, (II, 4),

the parvenu reaches a stature rarely equalled on the stage of the XVIIth century.¹⁴ Herod's credentials are the deeds which have

⁶ Garnier, *La Troade*, III; cf. *Hippolyte*, IV; Montchrestien, *La Reine d'Escoffe*, I.

⁷ Des-Masures, *Tragédies Saintes*, ed. Comte, Paris, Cornély, 1907.

⁸ *Les Juives*.

¹⁰ Corneille, *Agésilas*, II, 1.

⁹ Corneille, *Suréna*, V, 3.

¹¹ Corneille, *Othon*, II, 2.

¹² Richelieu, *Rowane*, cited by L. Lacour, *Richelieu Dramaturge*, Paris, Ollendorff, 1925, 96.

¹³ Hardy, *Marianne*, II, 1.

¹⁴ This is only a threat; but the XVIIth century drama did not, so far as I know, actually represent kingly grandeur; an account of majestic bearing in Abbé Genest's *Pénélope* (1684), V, 8, is all I have found on the subject.

placed him "au nombre valeureux des plus braves guerriers" (Hardy). "La haute vertu" is the warrant of the self-anointed. It is, moreover, a requirement of true kingship. A Tiribaze,¹⁵ a Massinissa¹⁶ have claims of birth, but they must undergo the ordeal of war, for

C'est la guerre qui peut seule eschele des cieux,
Faire les hommes Rois¹⁷

However, the battlefield is not the sole testing ground. Internal affairs also promote enterprise. Even as it endorses the current dogma of allegiance,¹⁸ the theater clings to a different maxim,

vn populaire
Peut legitiment, ains . . . il se doit distraire
Du seruage importun d'un indigne seigneur.¹⁹

Indeed in numerous instances popular approval is the mark of power.²⁰

Still affirming that "le trône soutient la majesté des rois au-dessus du mépris,"²¹ the drama demonstrates that a king is vulnerable whose authority rests upon the prestige of office. Old age, for example, undermines sovereignty: subjects do not give their loyalty to a master who may not live to reward it,²² and transgressors are favored by the inertia of a *fin de règne*.²³ Inferiority in military leadership is another source of discomfiture: kings do not gain by being compared, for instance, with Roman generals.²⁴

But it is not alone the handicap of age or comparison with the Romans that makes kings paltry. The drama betters historical instruction in the representation of kings who are small in themselves,

¹⁵ *Tyr et Sidon*.

¹⁶ Corneille, *Sophomusbe*, cf. II, 2; III, 2.

¹⁷ *Tyr et Sidon*, I, 5. Cf. Th. Corneille, *Darius* (1659), II, 3

¹⁸ " . . . nous ne voulons point . . . souffrir que (les sujets des Roys), quoy qu'en apparence maltraittez . . . se rebellent contre leur Puissance" (D'Aubignac, *Pratique du Théâtre*, 1657, ed. Martino, Paris, Champion, 1927, 73).

¹⁹ Hardy, *Panthée*, I.

²⁰ Needless to say, the popular sentiment militates for the conqueror; cf. Corneille, *Nicomède*, II, 1; IV, 3; V, 5; Quinault, *Agrippa*, I, 4; *Astrate*, IV, 3; *Le Feint Alcibiade*, I, 2, Th. Corneille, *Bérénice*, III, 2.

²¹ Corneille, *Médée*, II, 3.

²² Corneille, *Othon*, I, 2.

²³ Montfleury, *Trasibule*, II, 2.

²⁴ Cf. Scudéry, *Eudowe*, II, 3; Corneille, *Sertorius*, II, 1, 2.

to whom "le ciel ne fit pas un courage royal,"²⁵ kings incompetent, mischievous, or futile. Parody of "les Rois . . . ont toujours des clartez que les autres n'ont pas"²⁶ is probably as frequent as the assertion itself. There is the conjuring of majesty ("Qu'en présence des rois les vérités sont fortes"), to bolster a fraud, with the result that a king is disgraced.²⁷ There is the spectacle of a king thanking Heaven for the "juste soin qu'il répand sur les rois" when he himself has just been tricked by his counselors.²⁸

The opposition party may be content to correct the behavior of an erring monarch, as in Rotrou's *Iphigénie*:

Ce n'est pas que, rebelle au joug d'un souverain,
Je fasse vanité d'en secouer le frein;
Mais je veux que ses lois comme ses mœurs soient bonnes,
C'est par où se maintient le respect des couronnes. (III, 5)

But the opposition often develops into threats. In Racine's *Iphigénie* Agamemnon encounters "Achille menaçant, tout prêt à l'accabler" (IV, 1), and Corneille's *Nicomède* (*Nicomède*) is coaxed into open rebellion against his sovereigns,

Le peuple ici vous aime, et hait ces cœurs infâmes,
Et c'est être bien fort que régner sur tant d'âmes. (I, 1)

In the early part of the century the theater gave new scope to the maker of kings. He was no longer slave or emperor but soldier, the subject of a king. The benedictions showered upon him leave no doubt about the standing of the benefactor . . . nor perhaps the posture of the beneficiary, "C'est lui qui (protège les couronnes) et c'est lui qui les donne."²⁹ Thus, in Garnier's *Bradamante* (I, 1) Charlemagne had said of God, "C'est lui qui ceint nos chefs d'un royal diadème." It is not surprising that an outburst of thanksgiving should voice the inescapable contrast:

. . . gagner la terre afin de la donner
Est bien plus glorieux que de la gouverner.³⁰

²⁵ Rotrou, *Les Occasions perdues*, I, 2. Cf Théophile, *Pyrame et Thisbé*, Corneille, *Nicomède*, Racine, *Iphigénie*.

²⁶ Du Ryer, *Alcione*, I, 1.

²⁷ *Nicomède*, III, 8.

²⁸ Campistron, *Andronic*, III, 8; cf. Quinault, *Bellerophon*, IV, 2; *Le Fent Alcibiade*, IV, 4, et seq.

²⁹ Rotrou, *Venceslas*, II, 4.

³⁰ Rotrou, *Bélisaire*, I, 6; cf. *Laodice*, I, 1.

Cornelle extended to such vassals the immunity of kings: "de pareils serviteurs . . . Sont au-dessus des lois."³¹ But a king who had applauded a lieutenant's deeds, saying: "J'emporte tout le fruit," realized. "et lui toute la gloire";³² and gratitude was checked by an axiom of the *art de régner*,

Ce qui s'élève trop doit donner de l'ombrage . . .
 . . . le trop de mérite et d'estime publique
 Sont des excès à craindre en bonne Politique . . .³³

A king (*Les Occasions perdues*) is easily persuaded that his victorious field-marshal covets his crown. Prusias fears that, having increased his estate, Nicomède may anticipate his death. Orode destroys Suréna for services "au dessus de toute récompense." Reliance on a vassal who has the popular favor is no tenet of the *métier de roi*. A prudent monarch avoids the risk. Louis XIV and Emperor Paléologue³⁴ kept, the one a nephew, the other a son, away from battlefields.

The repressions to which he is subjected cooperate with his own initiative to make the conqueror a glorious figure. If he uses his advantages to usurp power, success is his exculpation,

Tous ces crimes d'état qu'on fait pour la couronne,
 Le ciel nous en absout alors qu'il nous la donne³⁵

He is but a man of destiny, one "dont le ciel fait choix." Failure is the real sin of a *coup d'état*, since the attempt in itself "n'a rien qu'un plein succès ne rende légitime."³⁶

Modesty, we have seen, is not the mark of the parvenu. Furthermore, his capacity as ruler does not tend to dampen his pride. The prerogatives denied to him are no greater than the concessions exacted of the hereditary monarch. He, too, may experience that "les royautés sont choses passagères," and shares with his legitimate confrère in the impatience of the people toward aging sovereigns. He may perish in the sort of rebellion in which kings are overcome. The dramatists go further; their regard for tradition

³¹ Horace, v, 3

³² Suréna, III, 1.

³³ Bellérophon, I, 3 and II, 2. Cf. my article on *l'art de régner* in *MLN*, L, 417.

³⁴ Andronic, I, 6; II, 5.

³⁵ Corneille, Cinna, v, 2.

³⁶ Agésilas, v, 7.

is expressed by assurances that God permits the rise of self-made kings "Pour voir à plus d'horreurs leurs forfaits réservés,"³⁷ or by scenes of remorse interpolated in the usurper's progress³⁸ The fact remains that the self-made king is a competent administrator who earns the respect of subjects and neighbors, and enjoys the average tenure of his office.

Following in the footsteps of Herod, the self-made king acquired a degree of elegance. His evolution was apparently epitomized by Corneille's Augustus (*Cinna*), at least he may be seen in comparison with the self-made emperor "qui s'élève d'une bassesse cruelle et tyrannique jusqu'à la sublime clémence" (Lanson). The revelations of a Phocas, "Qui de simple soldat à l'empire élevé Ne l'a que par le crime acquis et conservé,"³⁹ are in line with Augustus' account of his past. The weariness of the one is an echo of the other's disillusionment. But Phocas, who boasts "une obscure naissance," does not reach to the serenity attained by the son of a Cæsar. King Grimoald (Corneille, *Pertharite*), formerly comte de Bénévent, on the other hand, surpasses the Roman emperor, for not only does he repudiate "l'art de régner qui permet des crimes" (II, 3), and rule "en prince magnanime qui chérit la vertu" (I, 4), but he fulfills the aspiration Augustus had caressed: he steps down from the throne.

Grimoald's renunciation stresses an aspect of the dramatic spectacle the conquerors make of themselves. Their rise, which is seldom guided by political ambition, is generally controlled by self-respect. Their campaign often is a love courtship. Phraarte (Hardy, *Phraarte*), Tyndate (Scudéry, *L'Amour Tyrannique*), Alcionée are indifferent to the political booty acquired in the course of gallant pursuits. Grimoald gives full expression to the sentiment of his predecessors for crowns as such,

. . . (Si) pour vous aimer et ne vous point déplaire
Ce grand titre de roi ne fût pas nécessaire,
Je me vaincrois moi-même, et lui rendant l'état,
Je mettrois ma vertu dans son plus haut éclat (v, 2).

Conquerors are also led by a craving for glory. Their generosity is then all the more baffling to professional kings whose pettiness

³⁷ *Trasibule*, I, 3, cf. Corneille, *Héraclius*, II, 2.

³⁸ Cf. *Trasibule*, v, 3, Th. Corneille, *Cinna* (1661), I, 1.

³⁹ *Héraclius*, I, 1.

it illuminates.⁴⁰ Rotrou's *Bélisaire*, for example, is the experience of a soldier who worshipped his king as the fountainhead of all virtues and humbly sought his esteem, until disillusion suggested a revaluation of merits. (v, 5.) Corneille again sharpens the blows. King Orode, incapable of trusting the disinterestedness of a subject who restored him, demands a binding tie. Suréna, too loyal to marry the daughter of his king, proposes an arrangement which carries its own comment,

Osez me dispenser de ce que je vous doi,
Et pour la mériter je cours me faire roi . . . (*Suréna*, III, 2)

Where *Bélisaire* implored understanding, *Suréna* strikes with crushing assurance,

Mon crime véritable est d'avoir aujourd'hui
Plus de nom que mon roi, plus de vertu que lui (v, 2)

Thus, professing axiomatically the national sentiment for hereditary rulers, the XVIIth century French drama elaborates complacently the *raison d'être* and the evolution of self-made leaders. A battle-won crown becomes an essential of genuine kingship, a crown-giving victory a brevet of election, a successful administration a seal of legitimacy. The *art de régner* of traditional monarchy and the individual shortcomings of its representatives contrast with the capabilities of the newcomer and contribute to make the latter a popular hero. Nor is opportunism limited to feats of valor and genius for governing; the spectacle is climaxed with a soldier scorn-ing reward and overwhelming his king by the ascendancy of personal worth over inherited title.

MAURICE BAUDIN

New York University

⁴⁰ Expressions of gratitude provoke rebuke. Quinault, *Le Mariage de Cambise*, I, 4.

Quand tout votre bonheur ne seroit dû qu'à moi;
La vertu que j'aurois dans un degré suprême
Auroit dû ne chercher de prix qu'en elle-même.

Cf *Suréna*, II, 1.

REVIEWS

Les Bâtards au théâtre en France de la Renaissance à la fin du XVIII^e siècle. Par MAURICE BAUDIN. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. Londres: Oxford University Press. Paris: Belles-Lettres, 1932. Pp. 122.

Il n'est pas trop tard pour ramener l'attention sur ce bon travail dû à un jeune érudit qui a, par ailleurs aussi, donné des preuves de personnalité et de pénétration dans les questions de théâtre.

Sur les infirmes sociaux que sont les bâtards tels que la scène les a présentés, M. Baudin apporte une documentation qui se sait incomplète, mais qui permet des conclusions solides. Ce qu'il expose c'est au fond la légende dramatique du bâtard. Une légende plus qu'un type. Ce n'est pas "d'après les mœurs mais d'après les romans" que le XVII^e siècle inaugure le sujet de la bâtardise (que la Renaissance avait traité à la grecque dans la tragédie). Il faut noter, avec M. B., le curieux paradoxe par lequel "le théâtre conservateur du XVII^e siècle a glorifié la jeune fille seule" et même les filles de naissance illégitime. C'est par le romanesque coulant à plein bord dans le dramatique que le XVII^e siècle "a jeté les grandes lignes de la version théâtrale de la bâtardise.

Le XVIII^e siècle, lui, a fait, suivant les genres dramatiques, un rangement finement observé par M. B.: tradition indulgente dans la comédie; nettement apologetique, à l'occasion, dans la tragédie. Le bâtard, dans la seconde moitié du siècle, est déjà traité non seulement avec sérieux mais avec enthousiasme. Ainsi le bâtard-providence de Diderot (ami du bâtard d'Alembert.) Et le bâtard-sauveteur de Sedaine. Dorval du *Fils Naturel* esquisse le noble revendicateur du théâtre romantique. Ancêtre, dit M. B., bien plus que Figaro des bâtards du théâtre XIX^e siècle. En général

la version théâtrale de la bâtardise ne devait jamais coïncider avec son modèle courant. C'est un sort. Qu'elle embellisse ou qu'elle dénigre, voilà toute l'histoire de ses variations; et la distance n'est certes pas plus considérable de la version du XVIII^e siècle à la réalité que de la réalité au tableau qu'en fera le XIX^e siècle.

Il est arrivé que la sympathie prêchuese a pris peu à peu la place de l'intérêt romanesque.

Quant à la contre-partie du sujet des enfants naturels, celui de leurs géniteurs non moins naturels, M. B. y touche nécessairement. Mais il y a là une question particulière et si curieuse (n'est-ce pas un des cas où le plus nettement la Société a été rendue responsable des écarts de l'individu?) à laquelle il eût pu s'attacher encore davantage. En tout cas, tel qu'il l'a conçu et traité son sujet est plein d'intérêt et de vie.

LOUIS CONS

Columbia University

Les Débuts de P. Corneille. Par LOUIS RIVAILLE. Paris: Boivin, 1936. Pp. 807. Fr. 60.

Deux Classiques français vus par un critique étranger, VALDEMAR VEDEL. *Corneille et son Temps—Molière.* Traduit du danois par Madame E. CORNET. Paris: Champion, 1935. Pp. 520. (Bibl. de la RLC., 104.)

M. Rivaille's thesis is the most extensive work ever written, or, probably, that ever will be written, on Corneille's first six plays. In Part I he discusses dates, presentation, characters, structure, comic and pathetic elements, style, etc., as well as the relation of the plays to one another, to Corneille's personality, and to the work of his predecessors in drama. If his conclusions alter little what has already been written about the plays, it is valuable to have earlier investigations confirmed by such exhaustive treatment. In Part II he compares in detail C.'s work with Jesuit doctrine and concludes that there was in all probability a direct influence of these Fathers upon him. He also studies C.'s art, especially the type of verse he employs, which R. describes as *idéométrique*. He holds that C had two major directives, his interest in *la vie mondaine* and his adherence to certain beliefs that accord with those held by the Jesuits and explain both his theoretical and uniform treatment of character and the emphasis he places on the will. Both tendencies are found in all six plays, but the first is dominant in *Mélite*, the second in *la Place royale*, so that the plays show C. to have been evolving towards the attitude displayed in his tragedies. R.'s book, while unnecessarily long, is well written and wins the reader's confidence. There are only a few details in which I have any reason to take issue with him.

P 35, though R is sure that Montdory produced *Mélite*, he hesitates to affirm that his was the troupe subsequently known as that of the Marais, but there is no other troupe to which Corneille could have referred in 1660 as having been *établie* by *Mélite*, for his statement excludes the troupe of the Hôtel and he knew that other companies, except that of the Marais, had been merely passing visitors in Paris P. 69, Chappuzeau, whose MS. was completed in 1673, should not be cited as evidence that troupes played at Rouen before *Mélite* was written, for he may have been referring merely to subsequent visits of the Marais troupe, which we know to have taken place Pp. 76-81, R accepts as highly probable M Charlier's theory that *Citandre* was influenced by the trial of Marillac, but, before doing so, he should have discussed the objections I raised to this theory, especially the difficulty of believing that a young dramatist would give advice to Richelieu in so delicate a matter and the fact that the Cardinal remained so oblivious to C.'s attitude that he pensioned him shortly afterwards P. 193, a farce regularly followed a longer play P. 390, M Martinenche's assertion that the Spanish drama influenced *Médée* is based on the notion that Seneca should be counted as a Spanish dramatist, it might have been well to call this to the attention of the reader, who may not realize that there

could be a Spanish tragedy several centuries before there was a Spanish language Pp. 567, 577, R. objects to C's counting *tiens* as two syllables and *chiens* as one, although the words were regularly counted in this way in the seventeenth century (*Qui veut noyer son chien . . .*), "*sienne* compte pour une syllabe, et *tienne* (verbe) pour deux," but Marty-Laveaux gives the hemistich as "*il faut que l'on la tienne*" and notes no variant P. 783, l 9, for 1635 read 1625.

In 1927 Mr. Vedel brought out in Danish a treatise on Corneille and his times; in 1929, one on Molière; in 1932, one on Racine. The first two have now been translated into French by Mme Cornet. In both essays V. brings out clearly the merits and the limitations of his authors, reinforcing his views by frequent and apt quotations and relating their work to the general characteristics of French seventeenth-century literature and society. He addresses himself to the cultivated public rather than to specialists, who may be surprised to find somewhat limited bibliographical references, comparatively little concern with other dramatists than Corneille and Molière, echoes of old errors,¹ and certain assertions for which it is hard to find evidence:

Dans le portrait de tel mari, faible devant sa femme et voulant à tout prix éviter une scène . . . il peut être permis de voir le reflet de la vie conjugale du poète [Corneille] (p 130) Pauline et Sévère qui finiront bien par s'épouser un jour (p 234). Au collège des jésuites il [Molière] avait . . . joué des comédies latines (p 240) *Timocrate* avait remporté le plus grand succès du siècle (p 248) Le premier *Tartuffe* avait un dénouement aussi amèrement cynique que *Le mariage forcé* (p. 342).

In the main, however, the historical foundation is sound; the interpretation of the two dramatists, interesting and stimulating, even if it will not receive entire acceptance.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

¹ Dates of the *Duc d'Ossonne* (p. 63), *Periharite* (p. 228), *Dictionnaire des précieuses* [ascribed to Sorel; is this a misprint, or does V accept Warshaw's theory that Somaize was Sorel ?] (p. 280); exaggeration of Spanish influence (pp 70, 77, 180, 396), Henriette d'Angleterre is said to have suggested to Corneille the subject of *Tite et Bérénice* (p. 153); the *Ecole des maris* is thought to have been, perhaps, the first comedy called an *école* (p. 300); the subject and situations of *Le mariage forcé* are said to be borrowed directly from the Italians (p 320) There are also slips that I have not seen elsewhere: p 64 (twice), *Oromane* for *Orosmane*; p 80, mention is made of the quarrel in *le Cid* between two "vieillards," which would make an old man of the Count; p 406, V. overlooks the "machine" plays of Molière's contemporaries; p. 425, V. asserts that *l'Avare* was the only five-act comedy in prose that Molière wrote, p 468, V puts Argante into the famous sack into which Molière had put Géronte and Boileau, Scapin.

- A Biographical Sketch of John Young, Bishop of Rochester, with Emphasis on His Relations with Edmund Spenser.* By ALEXANDER CORBIN JUDSON. Indiana University Studies, No. 103. Bloomington January, 1935 (for March, 1934). Pp. 41. \$.75.
- Spenser and the System of Courtly Love.* By EARLE B. FOWLER. Louisville, Kentucky: Privately printed, 1934. Pp. 91.
- Spenser's Faerie Queene. An Interpretation.* By JANET SPENSER. New York Longmans, Green & Co., 1935. Pp. 144. \$3.40.
- Platonic Ideas in Spenser.* By MOHINIMOHAN BHATTACHERJE. New York Longmans, Green & Co., 1935. Pp. 200.
- A View of the Present State of Ireland.* By Edmund Spenser. Edited principally from the MS. Rawlinson B 478 in the Bodleian Library and MS. 188:221 in Carus College, Cambridge, by W. L. RENWICK. London: The Scholartis Press, 1934. Pp. 330. 10s. 6d.

Mr. Judson supplies many details to the known facts in the life of John Young, Bishop of Rochester, whom Spenser served as secretary in 1578. In addition, he examines the "character and opinions of Young" and attempts an estimate of his influence on Spenser. This influence is to be seen chiefly in the *Shepherd's Calendar*, written, most likely, while Spenser was acting as Young's secretary. Spenser's championship of the Puritan cause, his admiration for Archbishop Grindal, his anti-papal sentiments, were either inspired or stimulated, Judson thinks, by his association with the Bishop of Rochester. Mr. Judson identifies Diggon Davie (September) with Young, and suggests Susan Watts, Young's step-daughter, as Dido. Spenser, he thinks, was her tutor. It is to be hoped that Mr. Judson's painstaking search for information about one of the most important of the Spenser circle will stimulate others to go and do likewise for the other associates of Spenser.

Mr. Fowler here supplements his former monograph, *Spenser and the Courts of Love* (Menasha, 1921) with two more chapters from his University of Chicago doctoral dissertation. To these he adds an introduction and a chapter on "Spenser's Ovidian Lover." Mr. Fowler's method is to cite parallels to Spenser's scattered remarks on love from the courtly love writers, chiefly from Andreas Capellanus, William IX of Poitou, *M. E. Court of Love*, Chrétien, Gower, *Der Kittel*, etc. Frequent citations from Petrarch show, however, that Mr. Fowler is aware that many of the "conventions" could have come to Spenser through the sonnet, rather than directly from the writers of courtly love literature. The one Ovidian

episode is the Hellenore-Paridell story, and Mr. Fowler finds frequent parallels in Ovid's *Amores* and *Ars Amatoria*. But in conclusion he is convinced that Spenser, although he scoffed at "courtly conceits" in his *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*, personally embraced the Platonic Philosophy of love and adhered to it to the end of his career.

Miss Spens says in her preface that her book has been more than five years "on the stocks." "During that time the river of American critical works on Spenser . . . has risen to a flood." I prefer to quote her exactly in the following from the Preface:

Two courses were open to me. either to make a complete study of this critical work, and answer or incorporate its conclusions in my own book, or to ignore it, only taking cognizance of it where its results seemed certain, and would invalidate my own theories. I chose the second course, and have tried to read all books and articles, the titles or available synopses of which suggested that they would cut across my ground. On the whole it has not seemed necessary to deal directly with them.

Most of the titles must have been deceptive and the available synopses few and extremely brief, for I can find but one original idea in the whole work—the thesis that the books of the *Faerie Queene* originally contained but eight cantos and that the first plan called for eight books instead of twelve. This idea is supported by no evidence other than the statement that the last canto of *Mutabilitie* was numbered viii and left unfinished, and that Redcrosse says at the end of Book I (canto 12, we notice) that he still has six years in which he has vowed to serve the Faerie Queene. He has already served one; so his entire service was for seven years. There would be, then, seven quests in seven books and a last or summarizing book. A study of Spenser's use of the numbers three, seven, and nine and of the various changes in these numbers between the 1590 and the 1596 texts and even in the corrections made during the course of the printing of the 1596 edition will show how careless he was in such matters and how little significance can be attached to any of them.

Dr. Bhattacharje's study of Platonic ideas in Spenser is a part of a dissertation presented to the University of Calcutta for the doctorate in English. As Professor Legouis remarks in his "Foreward" to this book, this is no mere summary of European researches but a personal and original examination of a special problem. Professor Legouis cites a recent publication of Spenser's translation of the *Axiochus* as further evidence for the thesis that Spenser knew and used Plato's works, though the *Axiochus* is no longer attributed to Plato. To Spenser, however, it was as much the work of Plato as the *Symposium*. When studying the influence of an ancient author on Spenser, or any other, one should first determine what works of the author were available to him and in what form. For example, it is certain that when Spenser referred to Chaucer he thought of him as the author of the *Ploughmans*

Tale and other works no longer ascribed to him. It has been shown recently by Professor Jones and Mrs. Hulbert that Spenser's knowledge of Aristotle came largely from the Medieval and Renaissance commentators on him. Evidence is given by Professor Padelford in his edition of the *Aziochus* that Spenser, although he used a parallel Greek and Latin text, made no use of the Greek text. Dr. Bhattacharje has failed to give us, then, what we would most like to know, viz., what works of Plato (if any) did Spenser read, and in what texts. Did he not get most of his information at second hand, through the Neo-Platonists and the Renaissance commentators? We can be certain that he did not read Jowett's translation.

In his discussion of Temperance in chapter I, for example Dr. Bhattacharje neglects wholly the medieval and Elizabethan writings on psychology and physiology, in which can be found better parallels to the ideas which he traces directly to Plato. In chapter II, Chastity, he neglects the Court of Love conventions; and in chapter III, Truth, he misses the mark because he fails to recognize the influence of the Morality Plays on both the structure and the ideas of Book I. The second part of the book is devoted to "Neo-Platonism" and traces Spenser's theories of beauty and love in his *Hymnes* to the influence of the Italian neo-platonists. Here the author is on surer ground, but he fails to take sufficiently into account the background of the Christian mysticism.

Dr. Bhattacharje's book is an attempt to supply a badly needed study, and although it leans heavily on the inadequate treatments of Harrison and Winstanley, it is a much more thorough investigation than we have yet had.

Since I do not now have access to the MSS. used by Mr. Renwick, I cannot review his text. His textual notes, however, leave much to be desired. Although he says that he has examined ten MSS. in the preparation of his text, his meager "Selected Comparative Readings" (pp. 321-8) give the reader no idea of the value of the various MSS. I don't see why he bothered to give any variants, for his manner of presentation is so confused that the reader is never quite sure which text has the reading. For example, we have (p. 320) this heading: "The italicised words in the following list appear in B, but are omitted from our text as superfluous." Does he mean that they appear only in B, or are they in the other MSS. as well? Note the following item in this list: "P. 22, L. 15. Waist-inge and spoylinge." Why omit the last part of this if it occurs in all MSS.? To say the least, Mr. Renwick's textual notes are confusing.

Although he makes quite a point of the note on MS. Rawlinson B entering it for publication, Mr. Renwick did not see fit to examine Gough MS., Ireland 2, in the Bodleian, which has an elaborate title page and gives many other evidences of having been prepared for publication, though incomplete in its present form. He neglected to note the name of Arthur Chichester, who was Lord Deputy in

Ireland from 1604 to 1613, on the first page of Add. MS. 22,022 in the British Museum, though he does think that it was made by someone with a knowledge of Irish. Too, although he tells us that MS. Dd. x. 60, in the Cambridge University Library, and MS. 510, in Lambeth Palace, are "hurried" copies of Rawlinson B 478, which is the basis of his text, he gives no textual evidence to support his statement. Indeed, he gives no readings at all from them, saying (p. 321) that "they normally follow B." So far as Mr. Renwick's evidence is concerned, any one of these MSS. could be copied from the other.

The Commentary is very little better. On p. 24 we read concerning the date of the *View*. "Again we might have expected some reference to the taking of Cadiz in June, especially as Essex is—somewhat doubtfully—alluded to near the close." Obviously he has not seen the recent article, "The Date and Purpose of Spenser's *View*," *PMLA*, XLVII (1932), 137-144, in which Mr. W. C. Martin contends plausibly that the "noble person, who . . . coasting upon the South Sea stoppeth the ingate of all that evil" [Spain] is Essex and that Spenser is here referring to the Cadiz expedition. Mr. Renwick's note (p. 281) refers this passage to the Earl of Ormond. Although he might not agree with Martin's conclusions, he should certainly take them into account. There are a great many other references to contemporary events in the *View* which have a bearing on the date, but Mr. Renwick has not noticed them in his Commentary.

In a postscript he lamely defends himself for excluding, or forgetting, the "Briefe Note of Ireland." He says (p. 329): "The only evidence for attributing it to Spenser is that it [the MS. in the P. R. O.] is endorsed 'by Spenser' in a later hand." He does not seem to be aware of the copy of the first part of this document in the British Museum (Harl. MS. 3787, 21, fol. 184) which is headed "Spenser's discourse briefly of Ireland," with a subtitle, "certain promises to be considered in the recovery of Ireland." At the end of the document are the following lines:

Mark Irish when this doth fall
 Tirone and Tire all
 A peere out of England shall come
 The Irish shall tire all and some
 St Patrick to St George a horseboy shalbe sene
 And this shall happen in ninetye nyne.

These verses obviously refer to Essex and give the date of the document, then, as early in 1599 or late in 1598. Mr. Renwick may arbitrarily dismiss one ascription of the "Brief Note" to Spenser, but he cannot so easily dismiss two.

RAY HEFFNER

The Real War of the Theatres. Shakespeare's Fellows in Rivalry with the Admiral's Men, 1594-1603. Repertoires, Devices and Types. By ROBERT BOIES SHARPE. (The Modern Language Association of America, Monograph Series, Vol. v.) Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1935. Pp. viii + 260. \$2.50.

The Real War of the Theatres, in the opinion of the author of this volume, was an active rivalry between the two most important Elizabethan dramatic organizations, the Admiral's men and the Lord Chamberlain's men. This was partly a contest for the favor of the London audience and partly a struggle of two political parties. Each group defended its ideals of acting and production, supported the personalities and prejudices of its patrons in matters of statescraft, and derided those of its rivals.

This is Professor Sharpe's thesis. He seeks to establish its truth by reminding us that the patron of the Admiral's Company, Charles, Lord Howard of Effingham, was the most distinguished member of Cecil's party. Consequently, his players were compelled to advance the political fortunes of this group. This party of elder statesmen, being austere and conservative, took no active literary or theatrical interest in the performances of this company, devoted though it was to their political interests. Indeed, the audiences to which the Admiral's men appealed were anything but aristocratic. They were dowdy, citizen-like, and naive in their dramatic taste.

The Lord Chamberlain's Company, for its part, was favorable to Essex and his political and personal ambitions. This partisanship was due not so much to the influence of the Chamberlain himself as to the younger members of the family, Sir Henry, a younger son of the first Lord Hunsdon and a seventh son, Robert. They were active supporters of Essex and imposed on the company their political bias. These dashing gentlemen were vitally interested in the drama as an art. And Professor Sharpe insists that they set the tone of the average audience at the plays of the Chamberlain's men. They were the "retainers and followers of the warlike Earl of Essex, who, as great an attraction as the play itself, perhaps graced the box balcony at the rear of the stage, with an arm over the shoulder of his friend, the gay young Earl of Southampton." (P. 19.)

With these assumptions, almost completely unsupported by evidence, firmly in his mind, and with his creative imagination working with freedom and ingenuity, the author examines the repertory principally of these two companies, season by season, from 1594 to 1603, to discover the "complex interrelationships among happenings in the nation and on the stage."

The results are highly entertaining. The author writes with spirit and literary skill and is able to communicate to the reader

much of the enjoyment he clearly had in composing his work. He evidently has been exhilarated by giving free rein to his lively and fertile imagination. His mind, resembling that of his obvious hero Essex and those of his followers, is too restless to submit itself to the control of discoverable facts and realities. Consequently, it fares forth on island voyages into the realm of guess and conjecture. The present reviewer cannot recall any book so crammed with "perhaps," "it may be," "it may have been," and "it is hard not to believe." With their incessant aid, Professor Sharpe creates for his readers a brave new world of dramatic activity.

Some of the surprises to be encountered in this region are (1) that Bottom is a satiric portrait of Edward Alleyn, (2) that "the Gobbos in *The Merchant of Venice* must have been identified by audiences as the Cecils," (3) that "Dogberry's remarks, allowances being made for his wonderful confusion of ideas, may contain some obscure satire on Cecil's governmental actions," and (4) that "we may guess that Cicero (in *Julius Caesar*) represented one of the elder members of the Cecil party from the fact that the Admiral's men the year before had staged *Catiline's Conspiracy* by Chettle and Wilson, which must have given a favorable view of Cicero, since Cecil's partisans liked to call Essex Catiline."

These sentences have not been thrown out of intellectual focus by being thus isolated from their context, because they contain within their limits a complete history of the intellectual processes that brought them into being. Their critical and historical unsoundness is obvious. This quality is due primarily to absence of even enough fact to make conjecture more than a wild or brilliant guess, as the case may be. It is indirectly due, in the second place, to the author's attempting to cover, as he himself admits, "too great a sweep of history to be treated definitively within the scope of this study." He thus does not have enough time to canvass other possibilities of interpretation of character and dramatic motive than his own. Without any balancing of evidence, he at once explains every fact he touches by the exigencies of company rivalry, which was in essence political. This results in the anomaly of Professor Sharpe's treating a vast body of literature without considering, except fugitively, the demands and conventions of the dramatic form which must have largely determined the nature of the ideas, the situations, and the characters that he examines.

This unfavorable notice does not mean that the book is quite without value. Professor Sharpe has opened a comparatively new field of research, which should prove fruitful, in the undoubted rivalry of the two companies in their various appeals to the public. Doubtless any volume performing so important a service should be welcomed. However, a warning should be sounded against the continued use of the author's method in this field. It can never obtain results that will appear sound to either critical judgment or creative imagination. For this reason one may feel that it is not

the sort of study to have been, as it were, "crowned" by being published as Volume v of the Monograph Series of the Modern Language Association.

OSCAR JAMES CAMPBELL

Columbia University

Essays in Dramatic Literature: The Parrott Presentation Volume:
By Pupils of Professor Thomas Marc Parrott of Princeton
University, Published in His Honor. Edited by HARDIN
CRAIG. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1935. Pp.
viii + 472. \$4.50.

It was a happy thought to give this volume a unity foreign to most *festschriften* by limiting the contributors to drama subjects. For, though as his *vita* by Mr. J. Duncan Spaeth and his bibliography by Mr. Harry Clemons both testify Mr. Parrott's interests have ranged widely through English literature, it is his contributions in the Elizabethan field and most notably his sterling edition of Chapman's plays on which his reputation is based. Twenty-one of his pupils unite in an offering the loyalty of which any teacher might be proud of evoking.

Mr. Hardin Craig appropriately leads off with "Ethics in the Jacobean Drama: The Case of Chapman," tracing the conflict between the "natural" psychology of the Aristotelian ethics and the "more complicated and mechanistic" psychology of the Stoic, and setting Chapman forth not only as "a close student of psychology" but also as "the first great writer of the tragedy of passion, of psychological titanism." Mr. Craig's method is in salutary contrast to some critics' impatience with the "virtuous digressions." The danger lies in ascribing to rational processes or settled conviction what may sometimes as well be due to commonplace dramatic exigency or the merely literary impulse to embroider; but Mr. Craig brings together a coherent group of passages to support his assertion that "if [Chapman's] philosophy were better understood, his dramas would possibly seem more interesting and important." On the other hand, Mr. Charles W. Kennedy ("Political Theory in the Plays of George Chapman") thinks the dramatist's chief interest came to be political philosophy, a subject almost forced on him by the obstinacy of King James, but concludes that his position was based less on "technical theories of statecraft" than on "the Platonic tradition of justice and virtue" as the root of both citizenship and authority. Each of the two caveats mentioned in connection with Mr. Craig's essay applies here as well. Studies of this sort seem to the present writer usually to achieve interest rather than significance. What, for example, one would like to know, is the bearing of Mr. Kennedy's study on the prob-

probably less need for these reminders than there was ten or twelve years ago, but Mr. Croissant's annotated list of plays in which romanticism appears, beginning with Cowley's *Cutter of Coleman Street* in 1661, will be useful. Mr. Donald A. Stauffer's "A Deep and Sad Passion" describes *The History of King Edward II* attributed to the first Viscount Falkland, suggests that the development of English biography was powerfully influenced by the drama, and in a charming "feminine ending" plausibly assigns the *History* to Lady Elizabeth Cary, Falkland's Viscountess. Mr. Willard Thorp reconstructs the life of "Henry Nevil Payne, Dramatist and Jacobite Conspirator," whose tragedy *The Fatal Jealousy* (1672) follows the Shakespearean and not the Heroic model, and whose comedy *The Morning Ramble* anticipates by forty years Steele's crusade against duelling.

The remaining essays, comment on which must be omitted for want of space, are Mr. Lacy Lockert's "The Greatest of Elizabethan Melodramas" (*The Revenger's Tragedy*), Mr. George R. Stewart, Jr.'s "The Drama in a Frontier Theater" (in Nevada City, California), Mr. Theodore B. Hunt's "The Scenes as Shakespeare Saw Them," Mr. T. H. Vail Motter's "Byron's *Werner* Re-estimated. A Neglected Chapter in Nineteenth Century Stage History," Mr. Robert H. Ball's "Sir Giles Mompesson and Sir Giles Overreach," Mr. P. W. Timberlake's "Milton and Euripides," Mr. William Huse's "The Shipwreck" (its staging in 1746), Mr. P. S. Havens's "Dryden's 'Tagged' Version of *Paradise Lost*," Mr. George M. Kahl's "The Influence of Shakespeare on Smollett," and Mr. Rudolph Kirk's "Jane Bell: Printer at the East End of Christ-church." The volume sadly needs an index.

HAZELTON SPENCER

Thomas Lodge. By EDWARD ANDREWS TENNEY. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1935. Pp. xiv + 202. \$2.00. (Cornell Studies in English, xxvi.)

Mr. Tenney has written a thorough and useful account of the life of Thomas Lodge, making effective use of the results of recent investigations into the history of the various branches of the family. It would be difficult to find another family which would so richly illustrate the conditions of life in the bourgeois society from which Lodge sprang, and its records give a picture of absorbing variety and interest. It is well to have this material gathered into a single volume.

This study is concerned more with Lodge's biography than with criticism of his work. The author deals at some length with the history, curricula, and ceremonies of the various institutions which

contributed to Lodge's education, so that the poet's figure is set against a background of formal Elizabethan life of the specialized institutional kind which Lodge found most congenial. The melancholy story of the financial history of the Lodge family is lucidly set forth and the pictures of Thomas as student, debtor, adventurer, recusant, and doctor are clearly traced.

There are, however, a few points at which one might take issue with Mr. Tenney. This reviewer would like to have had more criticism of Lodge's literary work and is not prepared to accept entirely Mr. Tenney's low estimate of his ability as a poet. More might have been said of such important works as *Rosalynde* and *Phyllis* if so much space was to be given to *Robert the Devil* and *Wits Miserie*. A discussion of Lodge's use of his sources in the light of the Elizabethan attitude toward such matters would have been welcome, as Lodge has more than once been charged with direct plagiarism. The voyage to the Canaries with Captain Clark is thought by Mr. Tenney to have started on November 1, 1586, whereas the evidence seems to point to another voyage a year earlier. The account of the Cavendish expedition is an interesting *tour de force* but seems out of place in a book of this nature. It may have been that Lodge took an active part in the defeat of the Armada, as Mr. Tenney suggests (p. 87), but there is no evidence that he did so. The "extravagant melancholy mate" who, by "forestalling other men's inventions," forced the publication of the *Scyllaes Metamorphosis* volume must surely have been a rival and a plagiarist, not Richard Jones, the printer who set up the book containing Lodge's complaint. The Britwell copy of *Phyllis*, referred to on page 132, is now in the Huntington Library. But these are minor points, and some of them are open to debate. On the whole one can only be grateful for Mr. Tenney's work.

N. BURTON PARADISE

John Bunyan Mechanick Preacher. By WILLIAM YORK TINDALL.
New York: Columbia University Press, 1934. Pp. xii + 309.
\$3.50. (Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, CXIX.)

The view still prevails—in some quarters, at least—that John Bunyan, as a mechanick preacher, was an altogether exceptional figure, and that as a writer he stood in literary isolation from his age. His writings have been thought of, that is, as representing a literary achievement to be accounted for, if at all, mainly in terms of his genius, his supposed unique experience as a mechanick preacher, and his inspiration by the Heavenly Muse. It is the purpose of the present work to correct, or rather wholly to discredit,

the foregoing view of Bunyan the preacher and Bunyan the author. It may be said at once that Dr. Tindall accomplishes his purpose with a scholarly thoroughness that leaves few, if any, questions to be asked.

By way of preparation for his historical analysis, Dr. Tindall read some two thousand tracts written by Bunyan's evangelistic prototypes—the lay preachers of the seventeenth century—and by their friends and enemies. Secondary works, save that of John Brown, were not consulted until after the completion of the first draft of the study. The conclusions rest, therefore, upon the sixty works of Bunyan and the tracts of his contemporaries.

The importance of Dr. Tindall's contribution to Bunyan scholarship is apparent in every chapter of his treatise. The first and middle chapters consider Bunyan's chief works, and, with marked lucidity, relate these works, in point of style, purpose, and substance, to their seventeenth century milieu. *Grace Abounding* is shown, for example, to have close analogues in the numerous autobiographical tracts of the time which were composed by such lay preachers as Arise Evans, the gifted tailor, and Prophet Hunt, the rabbit keeper. And in the writers of such tracts are discoverable representatives of that large class of preachers from whom Bunyan differed, not in point of experience but in point of genius.

Bunyan's other writings similarly reflect his social, economic, and sectarian background. *Pilgrim's Progress* proves to be grounded in its author's evangelistic purposes—identical with those of Bunyan's contemporaries—and to be, like his other allegories, a literary extension of his sermons. This work is found, moreover, to be allied, in spirit and bias, to Bunyan's controversial tracts. It should be regarded, therefore, as having somewhat the character of a controversial pamphlet.

That Bunyan, with his fellow preachers, felt the full weight of social and economic oppression is evidenced, in particular, by *Mr. Badman* and *A Few Sighs from Hell*. *The Holy City* is in the millenarian tradition and gives evidence, according to Dr. Tindall, of Bunyan's familiarity with the Fifth Monarchy Movement. And in this movement or tradition Dr. Tindall recognizes a partial source for the city of Mansoul. He rejects altogether the view that the conception of Mansoul, the walled city of *The Holy War*, derives from Bunyan's military experiences.

The final chapters of the book consider the matters of Bunyan's style, his reputed illiteracy, and his sources or authorities. Inquiry into these matters reveals that Bunyan's reputation for illiteracy is on a par with his reputation for sinning—both partially fictitious but serving as eloquent tributes to the power and goodness of the Almighty, who could, through divine inspiration, raise an illiterate tinker to high levels of authorship, and who could, through His grace, lift the chief of sinners to the rank of saint. Dr. Tindall's conclusion is that Bunyan was fairly well read, and would have

given in his writings considerable recognition of his sources and authorities, but for his feeling that such recognition would invalidate his standing as a writer inspired solely by the Heavenly Muse. Even as it is, Bunyan reveals an acquaintanceship with Hobbes' *Leviathan*, and mentions such names as Luther, Dent, and Baxter—a dozen in all.

In Dr. Tindall's study, then, John Bunyan is considered in terms of his background, and is found not to be unique in his calling of mechanick preacher nor to stand, as an author, in literary isolation from men of his day, so far, that is, as the general style and substance of his writings are concerned. That Bunyan's genius did, however, serve to distinguish him from other lay preachers Dr. Tindall freely grants, but it was a genius that found the stuff of its creations in experiences that were common to a great number of Bunyan's contemporaries.

The book is written in a style that is scholarly, lucid, and highly readable. It is provided with an appendix containing some sixty pages of notes, a bibliography, and a good index. The appendix also contains an account of a lost, and hitherto neglected, tract of Bunyan's.

LOWRY CHARLES WIMBERLY

The University of Nebraska

Smollett et la France. By EUGÈNE JOLIAT. Paris: H. Champion, 1935. Pp. 279. (Bibliothèque de la Revue de Littérature Comparée, 105.)

M. Joliat's study contains three main sections: Part I discusses Smollett's relationship to French authors of picaresque romances, especially Lesage, Part II discusses his references to France and the French people; Part III is a history of the reception, in France, of Smollett's works, including a critical estimate of the separate translations. An appendix contains the documents relating to the seizure, at Boulogne in 1763, of Smollett's books. There is also a chronological table of the translations of Smollett's productions in the principal European countries, and a bibliography of these translations which shows the gradual diffusion over the continent of Smollett's chief works.

This book represents a vast amount of reading, but its clarity and precision, typical of good French criticism, together with a certain humor, make it far from pedantic. M. Joliat's knowledge, both of Smollett and of the general field of English and French literature, is extensive and sure. His first section is far superior to an earlier study by Wershoven (*Smollett et Lesage*) in its own restricted field, and has the additional merit of pointing out numerous analogies between Smollett's novels and such French

predecessors as Furetière's *Roman bourgeois*, Tristan l'Hermite's *Le Page disgracié*, and others. Its final chapter is a discriminating criticism of Smollett's translation of *Gil Blas*.

The second part is entitled "La France dans l'oeuvre de Smollett." It is excellent in its sympathetic understanding of the causes for Smollett's attitude towards France and Frenchmen, which, as shown in his novels, in *The Reprisal*, and in the *Travels*, was generally scornful or hostile. M. Joliat calls attention to the large number of French books noticed in the *Critical Review* during Smollett's active editorship, and to the fact that the accounts of them were generally full and favorable, although he realizes the difficulty of proving that any given article was written by Smollett himself. This section of the work is not quite so exhaustive as its title would indicate. M. Joliat mentions, but does not discuss, the twenty-five volume translation of Voltaire by Smollett and Francklin, for which Smollett provided at least the notes. He is justified in passing over entirely Smollett's translations from the *Journal Oeconomique*, which Smollett himself called "a paltry bookseller's job." He does not mention Smollett's History of France, in the *Modern Part of the Universal History*, nor his attitude towards France in his *History of England* and its *Continuation*. A considerable, if relatively unimportant, body of Smollett's work dealing with France is therefore omitted.

M. Joliat finds the explanation for the geniality of *Humphry Clinker*, as opposed to the rancor of Smollett's earlier novels, partly in the effect on the author of his long residence at Nice, where he achieved "la santé et le renouveau d'idées dont il avait besoin pour écrire son chef-d'oeuvre" (p. 157). This theory would be more convincing if Smollett had not written *The Adventures of an Atom*, in which he was most splenetic and atrabiliar, after his return from Nice and prior to *Clinker*.

The British or American student will find especially useful the third section of M. Joliat's book, since it contains much material inaccessible save in continental libraries as well as skilful organization and thorough discussion thereof. Here is a well documented study of the fluctuations of Smollett's reputation in France. M. Joliat takes into account the effectiveness (or ineffectiveness) of the translations as they appeared, the varying attitudes of French critics, both contemporary and in later periods, the storm of resentment at the picture of France in the *Travels*, and the effect produced by the inevitable linking of Smollett's name with Hume's as a historian. One might surmise that Smollett's novels would not appeal to contemporary French tastes. M. Joliat shows that they did not even have an opportunity: that the first translations of *Pickle* were hopelessly inadequate (Peregrine appears as "Sir Williams Pickle" and Smollett is nowhere mentioned as the author); that the first three editions of *Random* described the author as Fielding; and that not until the translation of *Fathom*,

in 1798, was Smollett's name attached to a French version of his novels.

Smollett et la France can scarcely be dealt with justly in a review of this length. The student, not merely of Smollett, but of comparative literature as well, will find this book of great value.

EDWARD S. NOYES

Yale University

Die Schöpfung der Gísla saga Súrssonar. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte der islandischen Saga. Von REINHARD PRINZ. Breslau: Ferdinand Hirt, 1935. Pp. vii + 176. Veröffentlichungen der Schleswig-Holsteinischen Universitäts-Gesellschaft Nr. 45. (Schriften der Baltischen Kommission zu Kiel, Band xxiv).

Prinz belongs to the recent school of investigators who look upon the Icelandic Sagas as works of art primarily, and as products of individual writers. His first task is, consequently, to lay bare the artistic tendencies of *Gísla saga's* author as they manifest themselves in the structure of the book. He shows that author's high skill in composition, his subtle character delineation, and the way in which he manages to combine both into the unity of the story. He also shows that the same author is under strong influence from the heroic poems of the Edda, an influence which reveals itself not only in plot and characters but also and chiefly in the writer's whole outlook upon life: in his heroic point of view.

Prinz shows, however, that in spite of the prevalence of this point of view, and in spite of the omnipresence, so to speak, of this author in *Gísla saga*, there are many and clear indications of the fact that he did not wholly invent the story, but found his material in a tradition which preserved for him not only the many verses of the saga (Gísli's verses) but a large number of tales, some of them connected, others disconnected, except for the fact that they all in some way concerned some of the persons of the saga. Most of them are woven with remarkable skill into the plot of the whole, but a good many of them show, according to Prinz, a spirit decidedly different from the heroic spirit of the author: they are of the nature of *fabliaux* and serve often as comic relief. One might question the necessity of attributing them to a different author on that score; or did not Shakespeare himself shape the comic relief in his tragedies?

Some tales or incidents in *Gísla saga* have parallels in other sagas, and the question is whether we have to do with pieces of tradition preserved in both works, or whether one writer has borrowed from another. Such are the incidents in connection with

Þorgrímr's murder, which Prinz thinks have been borrowed from *Droplaugarsona saga*, and not *vice versa* as others have thought. At any rate we seem here to have a string of literary motives. Prinz gives no parallel to the characteristic action of Gísli when he wades for a while in the brook to throw the pursuers off the track. A similar trick is practised by King Robert of Scotland when his enemies are on his heels with sleuth-hounds (Barbour's Bruce, Book VII, 17 ff.), and one wonders whether it was not also a literary motive.

To the important question of Christian influence and, in connection with that, the genuineness of some of Gísli's verses Prinz is not able to give a definite answer, although he leans to the opinion that the verses are genuine. Prinz thinks, however, that the softer side of Gísli's character, especially as revealed in the latter part of the saga in connection with these verses, is not very much in agreement with the general tendency and point of view of the author.

It would be an interesting speculation to try to draw the picture of the author who in the troubled age of the Sturlungs wrote *Gísli saga*. Would not such a man be likely to be both heroic and soft as Gísli was? Prinz does not attempt to answer that nor does he try to find any known man of that period to whom the saga could be attributed. Such an experiment, although necessarily problematic, could not be called futile. For insofar as the Icelandic Sagas are supposed to be the works of writers, rather than verbal products of saga-tellers from different undefined periods, those authors have to be sought in the Sturlunga period. To bring out the ideology of that period as a background to the Sagas seems therefore to be one of the major problems facing the school of investigators to which Prinz belongs.

And that brings up another important question. When it is realized that the art of the Saga is more due to the 13th century writers than to story-tellers of the preceding ages, it must be obvious that the 12th-13th century flourishing of Latin chronicles in Europe has something to do with it. Of course men like Koht have seen this clearly. But wouldn't it be illuminating to compare the art of these chronicles with the art of the Icelandic Sagas? Such a comparison has, as far as I know, never been done in detail but it would be an important contribution to our knowledge of the origin of the Saga.

Of course any investigation of this matter would fall outside the scope of Prinz's book. As it is, it is the most thorough account we have of the origin of *Gísli saga* and a very important addition, indeed, to our general knowledge of the Sagas.

STEFÁN EINARSSON

The Johns Hopkins University

The English Familiar Essay in the Early Nineteenth Century. By MARIE HAMILTON LAW. (University of Pennsylvania diss.) Philadelphia: 1934. Pp. 238.

The Works of Edwin Pugh. By THEOPHILUS E. M. BOLL (University of Pennsylvania diss.) Philadelphia: 1934. Pp. 104.

Miss Law's book is an account of the historical development of the familiar essay, and an analysis of the essays of Lamb, Hazlitt, and Hunt, made for the purpose of distinguishing between the old and the new elements which went into their making. There is little new in Miss Law's work except the synthesis achieved; her work retraces familiar lines, such as those, for example, laid down by Bryan and Crane in the introductory chapter to their collection, *The English Familiar Essay* (1916). Why Miss Law excludes the work of De Quincey from her consideration is not clear.

But though it offers little new material, the book is useful. A considerable body of material is brought together and ordered, and there is some very competent work in the analysis of the romantic elements which went into the work of Hazlitt, Lamb, and Hunt. The affinities of these writers to the poets of the time is recorded, though much more might have been made of the kinship in temperament of Lamb and Keats. The first part of her work, in which Miss Law deals with the heritage of the familiar essay from the past, is generous and painstaking, but is, in one or two respects, unsatisfactory. The effect of Montaigne and La Bruyère upon the familiar essay is recognized, but the peculiar impact of Montaigne upon the natures of Lamb and Hazlitt is not set forth in its proper significance. The English background is carefully surveyed, but a few things are missed: for example, Steele's account of his first acquaintance with death (*Tatler* 181) deserves mention in any account of the familiar essay. One is troubled throughout by occasional lapses in critical judgment. In her search for new elements in the familiar essay, Miss Law sometimes forgets that Hunt is a very imperfect artist; especially is this noticeable when his work is placed in juxtaposition to that of Lamb and Hazlitt.

Edwin Pugh (1874-1930) wrote sixteen realistic novels upon Cockney life in London, besides doing much work in the short-story, sketch, and other literary forms. None of his novels is now read, though just before the war Pugh was not without his following in England. Mr. Boll's dissertation is an analysis of Pugh's novels, and with considerable penetration he shows that Pugh's views of human nature were narrow, his characters all variations upon very few types, his settings unvaried, his construction uncertain, and his style, save in a few memorable scenes, undistinguished. It is a pity that Mr. Boll could not have found a better subject upon which to exercise his undoubted talents. Pugh's let-

ters have not been collected, and materials are not yet available for his biography. His works make singularly few demands upon the student of them, either in a knowledge of English or continental fiction, or in a grasp of general ideas.

WILLIAM CLYDE DE VANE

Cornell University

Paul Elmer More and American Criticism. By ROBERT SHAFER.
New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935. Pp. ix + 325.
\$4.00.

This ponderous work has three objects: to argue that most modern literary criticism, especially that of T. S. Eliot, Edmund Wilson, Ludwig Lewisohn, Van Wyck Brooks, and H. L. Mencken is leading the country astray; to set forth a proper philosophy of life and art, and to explain, discuss, and evaluate the career of Mr. Paul Elmer More. These purposes all have something to do with one another, but they get in one another's way, so that the unity of the book is agglutinative rather than organic.

Professor Shafer has succeeded in his main object, which is to trace the intellectual development of Mr. Paul Elmer More. The piety of the disciple has rescued from forgetfulness a number of verses from Mr. More's forgotten volume of poems of 1890—verses that were better left to oblivion—but in the main Mr. Shafer displays reasonable independence in evaluating Mr. More's essays and philosophical studies. This evaluation is, of course, within the canons of neo-humanism.

The critics of Mr. More, says Professor Shafer, have written "at once irrelevantly and abusively," desiring "at whatever cost to prejudice all issues in the minds of their readers," and he adds that "the self-righteous . . . are as open to this temptation as the most corrupt devotees of self-expansion" (p. 273). In the light of this passage it is interesting to observe Professor Shafer's treatment of those with whom he disagrees. I quote some characteristic phrases: "Several years ago a rather fumbling kind of book, entitled *The Reinterpretation of American Literature*, fell dead from the press, killed by too many doctors, some of whom had been allowed to drift into the wrong profession" (pp. 276-277). "Mr. Eliot, it would appear, reads a book, knowing he has to write a review of it, wondering what he can find to say about it . . . he is content to explain or defend his verdicts, apparently, by any readiest and shortest means that offers" (p. 19). "The difficulty one feels in reading these pieces, however, does not arise from their 'solemnity,' but from their pert assurance of tone, not fortunate in itself, and the less fortunate in the light of Mr. Eliot's subsequent changes" (p. 27). "When Mr. Wilson . . . reprobates Mr. T. S.

Elhot's moral solicitude, he merely betrays his own moral insensibility" (p. 179). Mr. Eastman's *The Literary Mind* is "one of the most bigoted books I have ever read. . . . And perhaps the desperateness of Mr. Eastman's struggle for money and position may be gauged from his attempt to impose on men a definition of poetry which, as he actually admits, will not account for poetry. . . ." (pp. 40-41). Dr. Lewisohn, "a professional man of letters, was recently reported in a European newspaper as saying . . . that he was being forced to *double* his annual output, because of the decline in the sales of his writings brought about by the depression. Who can help thinking that this sheds light on the real nature of work which, nevertheless, we are invited to regard as 'more significant than the struggle between armies with banners'?" (p. 51). ". . . opinions . . . more sensible than those ventilated by Mr. V. F. Calverton in his windy, pretentious, muddle-headed book, *The Liberation of American Literature*" (p. 277). Mr. Hicks' *Great Tradition* "is chiefly interesting as an illustration of the absurdities into which the spirit of fanaticism can lead inexperienced and unreflective young people" (p. 295).

As Professor Shafer remarks, the critics of Mr. More have written "at once irrelevantly and abusively," desiring "at whatever cost to prejudice all issues in the minds of their readers."

HOWARD MUMFORD JONES

Harvard University

BRIEF MENTION

Walter Savage Landon's Studies of Italian Life and Literature. By FELICE ELKIN. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1934. Pp. 221. (U. of Penn. diss.) John Forster, in his early biography of Walter Savage Landon, suggests the importance of Italy in Landon's career, but allots comparatively few pages to this background of his life. Yet about one quarter of Landon's total literary productions are concerned with Italy. We should be grateful to Miss Elkin not only for setting in order the known facts about his association with this country, but for investigating more intensively his Italian studies, as in his *Poche Osservazioni*, which Miss Elkin translates and offers as an appendix to her book. In addition, the volume contains evaluations of Landon in relation to Italian history, politics, religion, and to men of letters. Although not written with great distinction, Miss Elkin's dissertation seems to me the most valuable contribution concerning Landon in recent years, except of course T. Earle Welby's edition of the complete works.

I speculate somewhat upon the wisdom of Miss Elkin's continued reliance upon Landor's *Imaginary Conversations* and other writings as evidence of his own opinions since he himself warned us against this procedure. Many critics have noted the petulance and caprice of Landor's verdicts. a memorable picture of his fierce, whimsical judgments may, incidentally, be found in the record of Emerson's visit to Fiesole. Yet apart from this, the book contains an admirable array of facts defining Landor's conceptions of the country which he apparently both loathed and loved. Certainly it is suggestive to contrast the simple loyalties of other English men of letters—an interesting discussion in Miss Elkin's Book—with the complex feelings of Landor toward Italy's secular, religious, and artistic life.

STANLEY T. WILLIAMS

Yale University

Barry Cornwall A Biography of Bryan Waller Proctor, with a Selected Collection of Hitherto Unpublished Letters. By RICHARD WILLARD ARMOUR. Boston: Meador Publishing Co., 1935. Pp. 370. \$3.00. The first seven chapters of Mr. Armour's biography of Barry Cornwall are devoted to a sympathetic narrative of the events of the poet's life. Chapters eight to ten are critical discussions of the dramatic scenes and narrative poems, the plays, the songs, and the prose written by Cornwall. Part two (pp. 209-340) is composed of less than a third of the three hundred or so unpublished letters collected by Mr. Armour. There is an extensive bibliography and a useful index.

Mr. Armour's book is marked throughout by quiet competence, the result of careful workmanship and sympathetic insight. Cornwall (one finds it difficult to refer to him as Bryan Waller Procter) was not a very colorful or exciting figure, nor was his life eventful, so that Mr. Armour is not to be blamed because the volume he has worked on so long is not more interesting reading. In addition to furnishing many new facts about the poet's life and personality, Mr. Armour's critical discussion of Cornwall's work is the chief *raison d'être* for his study. Unlike many who have specialized in a biography of a minor literary figure, Mr. Armour makes no extravagant claims for the productions of his hero, finding him, even at his best, only a man of talent.

The chief weakness of the book lies in Mr. Armour's failure to project Cornwall against the life of the time as, for example, Michael Sadler has projected Bulwer-Lytton against the life of the time in his biographical study of that glittering figure. Wholly absorbed in biography, Mr. Armour has not evoked the muse of history. Even this defect, if it be one, is excusable; with so quiet a person as his hero, Mr. Armour might have found it difficult to

prevent Cornwall from being overwhelmed by the tumultuous life of the Regency and earlier Victorian decades. As it is, he seems to have said the definitive word on Barry Cornwall.

HOWARD MUMFORD JONES

Harvard University

Specimens of Sixteenth-Century English Handwriting Taken from Contemporary Public and Private Records. With introduction and notes by CYRIL BATHURST JUDGE. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1935. Pp. [xvi] + 24 colotype plates. \$3.50. The exact value of such a book as this, notwithstanding the high excellence of the facsimiles, is problematical. To the skilled reader of Elizabethan manuscripts—the documents here reproduced were written between 1520 and 1622—these facsimiles offer nothing new or of particular interest, to the novice in secretary paleography they must, owing to the absence of transcripts, be of very little value, if any. The least that Dr. Judge should have done is to have published transcripts at the back of his book (or elsewhere), if not on the pages facing the documents, so that the honest novice would be in a position to check his attempts at deciphering the papers set before him as exercises in a fairly difficult art. The reduction of some of the documents, especially plate XI, is also to be regretted, it makes the task of deciphering so much more difficult. The inclusion of Latin documents is also of questionable value; if the student is not a thorough Latin scholar he is sure to have no success whatever with them.

Some of Dr. Judge's statements in the introduction are either incorrect or incomplete. Thus, for example, he instructs the reader that "A wavy line through a single or a double *l* indicates missing letters." This is not always so; such strokes were often made purely for ornamental purposes; note the words "will" and "wholsome" in plate VIII. The flourish for "terminal -s, -es, -is" also stands for *as*, *os*, *us*, and *ys*, and sometimes occurs even *within* a word. So too the symbol for *per* or *par* is also constantly used for *por* (in "portrait"), *pur* (in "purpose"), and *pyr* (in "pyramid").

A brief but useful glossary precedes the facsimiles, as well as a fairly comprehensive bibliography. The book, a quarto, is handsomely printed on fine paper and is elegantly and well bound. But we do not like the absence of pagination, and we hope that the Harvard University Press will not adopt the practice even though the presence of numerals on a page is not considered artistic. In scholarly works page-numbering is absolutely essential.

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM

New York, N. Y.

A History of the Philadelphia Theatre 1835 to 1855 By ARTHUR HERMAN WILSON. Philadelphia University of Pennsylvania Press, 1935. Pp. xii + 724. \$6.00. This latest addition to the series of historical studies on the Philadelphia theatre, obviously stimulated by the researches of Professor Arthur Hobson Quinn, brings together a great deal of material hitherto buried in old newspapers and other periodicals and scattered in many places. It contains but little commentary on the material studied and its critical interpretation of plays and players is hardly significant. Its value as a future source for the study of the early American theatre is a little below that of Reese D. James's *Old Drury of Philadelphia* and somewhat above that of Thomas Clark Pollock's *The Philadelphia Theatre in the Eighteenth Century*, previous volumes in the series. Mention of "modern improvements . . . particularly in the scenic illusions," might be of value had the author also seen fit to study the nature of these improvements and illusions. Numerous plays are mentioned but, except in the case of such well-known works as Mrs. Mowatt's *Fashion*, no attempt is made to indicate their substance. Professor Wilson's belief that Boker's *Francesca da Rimini* is a "masterpiece" and "the greatest of American romantic tragedies in verse" is debatable. Nevertheless, the "Annual Chronological Records," which comprise the major portion of the book, are likely to prove of great help to the future historian of the nineteenth-century American theatre.

N. BRYLLION FAGIN

The Johns Hopkins University

Samuel Taylor Coleridge. A selected bibliography of the best available editions of his writings, of biographies and criticisms of him, and of references showing his relations with contemporaries. Compiled by VIRGINIA WADLOW KENNEDY, assisted by MARY NEILL BARTON. Baltimore: Enoch Pratt Library, 1935. Pp. viii + 151. The selection and arrangement of material, the annotations, and the 25-page index combine to make this an excellent working bibliography. The preface and introductory notes to the several sections indicate clearly its inclusions and exclusions, and its relations to other bibliographies. Its principal values as a supplement to the work of Wise and Haney lie in its listing of good recent editions now available in this country, and of many recent critical items, including the centenary publications of 1934, and in its thoroughly helpful and up-to-date annotations.

ALICE D. SNYDER

Vassar College

Workers in the Dawn. By GEORGE GISSING. Edited by ROBERT SHAFER. 2 vols. Pp. lvi + 374, 436. \$2 00. *John Keats, Complete Poems and Selected Letters* Edited by C. DEWITT THORPE. Pp. liv + 666. \$1.00. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, Doran, 1935. These two works with their clear print, attractive binding, and careful editing augur well for the new series which Professor Shafer is directing. He has himself taken charge of a reprint, the first ever made, of Gissing's powerful and almost unprocurable first novel and has furnished an introduction important for its facts as well as its comment. Professor Thorpe's *Keats* is the best in print and was much needed; the notes are excellent and the 150 pages of letters add greatly to the value of the book.

R. D. H.

Evolution and Repentance. By LANE COOPER. Ithaca· Cornell University Press, 1935. Pp. x + 253. \$2 25. This provocative and attractive little volume consists of "essays and addresses on Aristotle, Plato, and Dante, with papers on Matthew Arnold and Wordsworth," on the training and use of the image-making faculty in scholarship, and on "the evolutionary obsession." The essay on the making of a concordance brings out not a few illuminating facts concerning Wordsworth's diction (but see F. B. Snyder, "Wordsworth's Favorite Words," *JEGP*, xxii, 1923, pp. 253-6). In his familiarity with the best that has been written in the past and in his sound sense of values Professor Cooper recalls Arnold; one regrets that the volume is likely to reach and convince only those who need it least.

R. D. H.

A Bibliography of British History (1700-1715). With Special Reference to the Reign of Queen Anne. By WILLIAM THOMAS MORGAN. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1934. Volume I (1700-1707). Pp. xvii + 524. (Nos. 94 and 95, Indiana University Studies.) Professor Morgan is well known to historians for his work on *English Political Parties and Leaders in the Reign of Queen Anne* (1920). His present volume is the first installment of a bibliography of the books and pamphlets printed in the period from 1700 to 1715. His primary interest is in political, economic, and social history, and his bibliography is intended to be of service mainly in those fields. But within its limitations it will be indispensable for investigators in this period.

LOUIS I. BREDEVOLD

University of Michigan

John Wilson's The Cheats. Edited by MILTON C. NAHM. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1935. Pp. x + 280. 10 s 6 d. Mr. Nahm is to be congratulated on his industry in bringing to light new facts about the life of the royalist lawyer who, though he condescended to the stage, wrote one of the most popular of Restoration comedies. To some extent its success was one of scandal; and the MS at Worcester College, Oxford, which the editor carefully reproduces, is loaded with Sir Henry Herbert's censoring especially in the part of Scruple, who is aimed in the same general direction as Rabbi Busy and Tartuffe. Wilson, a serious satirist (he translated the *Moriae Encomium* of Erasmus) considered himself a son of Ben, and while *The Cheats* is crammed with his own learning, and though everything proceeds on a pretty low plane, much of the play is a tissue of Jonsonian reminiscence. Mr. Nahm has done an excellent job in outlining the extremely scattered sources, which include contemporary Rosicrucianism and Pascal's attack on the Jesuits. The chapter on the theatrical milieu is somewhat perfunctory, but adequate. Chapters V and VI on the relations of the MS and the quartos, and on the censorship, are of special value. There is no index.

H. S.

The Life and Death of William Mountfort. By ALBERT S. BORGMAN. (Harvard Studies in English, vol. xv.) Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935. Pp. xii + 222. \$2.50. Professor Borgman follows his excellent monograph on Shadwell with a circumstantial account of the murder of the eminent Restoration actor and minor dramatist, prefaced by a biographical sketch descriptive of his rôles and of the plays he wrote. Both sections of the book are thoroughly and in part newly documented. There is a good index, but a bibliography of Mountfort's works is wanting.

H. S.

The Rivals, A Comedy . . . By RICHARD BRINSLEY SHERIDAN, Esq. Edited from the Larpent MS. by RICHARD LITTLE PURDY. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1935. Pp. lii + 124. \$7.50. Eleven days elapsed between the first and the second performance, and what the brilliant young amateur was at in the interim may now be seen in the two versions here printed in parallel columns and analyzed in Mr. Purdy's introduction. The Larpent MS in the Huntington Library is the copy sent to the Examiner of Plays a week before the opening, while the first edition shows how Sheridan profited from the ordeal of that ghastly first night and from the remonstrances of the reviewers. On the other hand, there are in that first printed text,

besides changes and excisions, substantial additions which Mr. Purdy thinks were restored from the MS predecessor of the Lar-pent MS. His conclusion is that Faulkland and Julia were not concessions but dear to the author's heart. If with Goldsmith Sheridan led the van against sentimentalism, he was also like him in having left "important hostages in the camp of the enemy" This is a beautifully made book and to an old Sir Lucius a fasci-nating one, for the Irish knight is much improved. In later years Sheridan grew to hate indelicacy, but in his first play he "had mistaken his audience for the audience of Congreve and Wycher-ley." As the editor observes, the alterations sometimes left minor inconsistencies. To the description of typical changes might be added the occasional improvement of prose rhythm, transposition or invention of phrases to secure more effective curtain or exit speeches (Lar-pent's "*Acres*. You must permit me, by my Valour! my Dear Sir Lucius,—my best Friend—my brother Hero—my—" is discarded for the extraordinarily pretty "*Sir Luc* . . . Let your courage be as keen, but at the same time as polished as your sword."), and reiteration of lines or effects that had evidently gone well the first night, among them Sir Anthony's threat to "marry the girl myself."

H. S.

Die Technik des realistischen Dramas bei Ibsen und Galsworthy. Von ANNA KRONER. Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1935. Pp 113. M. 6. (Beitr. z. engl. Philol., Heft xxviii.) The title of this dissertation carefully refrains from using the word influence, and the conclusion draws up a list of similarities and dissimilarities between the two dramatists; yet, the question of influence does always lurk in the background and should have been faced and, if not answered, should at least have been defined in its problematic nature. For many of the traits which Galsworthy and Ibsen have in common may also have been derived from the Ibsenists and many of the deviations might be traced to an influence of Hauptmann, who simply cannot be left out of the picture altogether. All of which tends to show that the author did well not to speak of influence; but her position would have been safer if she had reversed the process of her in-vestigation, had begun with the different aims and viewpoints of the two dramatists and ended with their difference in technique. But the results of this dissertation are not without value and reveal an intelligent comprehension of the subject.

ERNST FEISE

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received]

Aberdein, Jennie W.—John Galt *London [and New York]*. Oxford U Press, 1936. Pp xxiv + 209 \$3 00

Bradbrook, M. C.—The school of night, a study of the literary relationships of Sir Walter Raleigh *Cambridge*. U Press, 1936 Pp viii + 190 \$2 25

Breton, Nicholas — Two pamphlets of, [Grimelios Fortunes (1604), An Olde Mans Lesson (1605)] Ed by E G Morrice. *Bristol* U of Bristol, 1936 Pp 127 5 sh (University of Bristol Studies, 4)

Chadwick, H. Munro and Chadwick, N. Kershaw.—The growth of literature Vol II (Russian oral literature, Yugoslav oral poetry, Early Indian literature, Early Hebrew Literature) *New York*: Macmillan [*Cambridge, Eng.* U Press], 1936 Pp. xviii + 783 \$9 00

Goodman, Theodore — Maria Edgeworth, novelist of reason *New York*: Graduate School of N. Y. U., 1936. Pp 16 (Abripgement of Thesis)

Gulick, Sidney L—A Chesterfield bibliography to 1800 *Chicago*. U of Chicago Press, 1935 Pp 114 (Reprinted from The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, Vol XXIX, 1935)

Hendren, J. W.—A study of ballad rhythm, with special reference to ballad music *Princeton* U Press, 1936 Pp xii + 177 \$2 00 (Princeton Studies in English, 14)

Hillhouse, James T—The Waverley novels and their critics *Minneapolis, Minnesota*. U of Minnesota Press, 1936. Pp xiv + 357. \$3 50

The Huntington Library Bulletin [Paderford, Frederick M "Robert Aylett", Farraud, Max. "Benjamin Franklin's Memoirs"; MacMillan, Dougald "The censorship in the case of Macklin's 'The Man of the World'", Nicolson Marjorie "Thomas Paine, Edward Nares, and Mrs Piozzi's marginalia"; Baker, C H. Collins: "William Blake, painter", Rolfe, Franklin P. "Letters of Charles Lever to his wife and daughter", Heltzel, Virgil B "Notes and documents—Raleigh's 'Even Such is Time'"] *Cambridge* Harvard U Press, 1936 Pp. 188 (Number 10 October, 1936)

MacLean, Kenneth.—John Locke and English literature of the eighteenth century *New Haven*. Yale University Press, 1936 Pp. vii + 176. \$2 50.

McKillop, Alan Dugald.—Samuel Richardson, printer and novelist *Chapel Hill*: U. of North Carolina Press, 1936. Pp xii + 357 \$4 00.

Raysor, Thomas M.—Coleridge's miscellaneous criticism. *Cambridge* Harvard U. Press, 1936. Pp xvi + 468 \$6 00

Reynolds, Ernest.—Early Victorian drama, 1830-1870 *Cambridge, Eng.* W. Heffer and Sons, Ltd, 1936 Pp viii + 163 6 sh

Richards, I A.—The philosophy of rhetoric. *New York and London*. Oxford U. Press, 1936 Pp x + 138. \$1 75 (Mary Flexner Lectures on the Humanities, III)

Shepperson, Archibald B.—The novel in motley, a history of the burlesque novel in English *Cambridge*. Harvard U. Press, 1936 Pp x + 301 \$3 00

Smith, Dane F.—Plays about the theatre in England from 'The Rehearsal' in 1671 to the Licensing Act in 1737 or, the self-conscious stage and its burlesque and satirical reflections in the age of criticism *London and New York*. Oxford U Press, 1936. Pp xxiv + 287. \$4 00.

Yeats, W. B. (ed).—The Oxford book of modern verse, 1892-1935. *New York*. Oxford U Press, 1936. Pp xlii + 454 \$3 00.

GERMAN

Aczél, Marta.—Frauengestaltung bei Theodor Storm Diss. *Frankfurt*. 1935 91 pp.

Aikin-Sneath, Betsy.—Comedy in Germany in the first half of the eighteenth century [Oxford Studies in Modern Languages and Literature] *Oxford*: Clarendon Press, 1936. 122 pp \$2.50.

Assmann, Elisabeth.—Die Entwicklung des lyrischen Stils bei Detlev von Liliencron Diss. *Königsberg*: Kummel, 1936 xvi, 145 pp.

Bauer, Ruth.—Studien zum Wigalois des Wunrt von Gravenberg [Germanische Studien. H. 180] *Berlin*: Ebering, 1936 121 pp M 5

Bergmann, Alfred. — Christian Dietrich Grabbe 1801-1836 Sein Leben in Bildern. *Leipzig*: Bibliogr Inst [1936]. 40 pp, 23 plates M. 90.

Bilgeri, Martin.—Das Vorarlberger Schrifttum und der Anteil des Landes am deutschen Geistesleben [Heimatkunde von Vorarlberg H 10] *Leipzig*: Schulwiss Verlag Haase [1936] iv, 168 pp. M. 3 60

Blume, Bernhard.—Das nihilistische Weltbild Arthur Schnitzlers Diss *Stuttgart*: Knoller, 79 pp.

Bunje, Emil T. H.—A Reinterpretation of the expository verses of the "Hildebrandslied" [Univ. of Calif. Publ in Modern Phi-

ology, Vol. 18, No 5] *Berkeley*: Univ of Calif. Press, 1936 Pp. 291-442.

Cassell's New German-English Dictionary with a phonetic key to the pronunciation of the German words by Karl Breul Thoroughly revised and enlarged by J. Herron Lepper and Rudolph Kottenhahn *New York*: Funk & Wagnalls Co [1936]. 813 pp. \$1 88

Cysarz, Herbert — Vom Dichter- und Meistertum Friedrich Schillers [Deutsche Blätter 21]. *Langensalza* J Beltz [1936] 16 pp M 015.

Detjen, Heinr. — Herman Bossdorf als Dramatiker Diss *Hamburg*. 1936. 119 pp

Durler, Josef. — Die Bedeutung des Bergbaus bei Goethe und in der deutschen Romantik [Wege zur Dichtung Bd 24] *Frauenfeld* Huber, 1936 245 pp M 720

Eegholm, Axel. — Metrische Beobachtungen mit bes Berücksichtigung der Versifikation im Nibelungenlied *Leipzig*. Harrassowitz, 1936 96 pp M 5

Eis, Gerhard. — Drei deutsche Gedichte des 8 Jhs, aus Legenden erschlossen [Germanische Studien, H 181] *Berlin*: Ebering, 1936 60 pp. M 260

Feist, Sigmund. — Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache mit Einschluß der Krimgotischen und sonstiger zerstreuter Überreste des Gotischen. 3. neubearb u verm Aufl Lfg 1 2 *Leiden*. Brill, 1936 xviii, 224 pp. Fl 6.

German Life and Letters. Edited by L A Willoughby. Quarterly Vol I, No 1 Oct 1936 *Oxford*. B Blackwell, 1936 80 pp 4 s 6 d

Goethe-Kalender auf das Jahr 1937 Hrsg vom Frankfurter Goethe-Museum. *Leipzig*: Dieterich [1936] 248 pp

Grützmacher, Richard H. — Goethes Faust Ein deutscher Mythos Tl 1. 2 [Preußische Jahrbücher Schriftenreihe 34. 35]. *Berlin*. Stilke, 1936. 188 pp M 7

Halperin, Natalie. — Die deutschen Schriftstellerinnen in der zweiten Hälfte des 18 Jh. Diss *Frankfurt*: 1935 71 pp

Hansen, Meinert. — Ernst Moritz Arndt Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung seiner Persönlichkeit und Gedankenwelt Diss *Hamburg*: 1936 70 pp.

Hellberg, Helmut. — Studien zur Dialektgeographie im Ruhrgebiet und im Vest Recklinghausen [Deu Dialektgeographie H. 37] *Marburg*: Elwert, 1936 80 pp M 480.

Hillmann, Margret. — Deutsches Geistesleben in der norwegischen Presse (1800-1860). Diss. *Leipzig*. 1936 88 pp

Hoffmann, Agnes. — Untersuchungen zu den altdeutschen Marco Polo-Texten [Freiburger Forschungen zur Kunst- und Literaturge-

schichte 4 Diss *Freiburg* 1 B] *Ohlau*: H Eschenhagen, 1936 x, 87 pp. M 6

Hofmannsthal, Hugo. — Bibliographie (von Karl Jacoby) [Hamburger Beiträge zur Buchkunde Bd 5 S-A aus Imprimatur 1931, 1932] *Berlin* Maximilian-Ges., 1936 182 pp M 15

Indogermanisches Jahrbuch Im Auftr der Indogerm Ges. hrsg von Albert Debrunner u Walter Porzig Bd 20, Bibliographie des Jahres 1934 *Berlin* de Gruyter, 1936 390 pp M 28

Jahrbuch des Freien Deutschen Hochstifts Frankfurt am Main 1934-1935 Im Auftrag der Verwaltung hrsg von Ernst Beutler *Halle*. Niemeyer [1936] 491 pp

Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie Hrsg von der Ges f deutsche Philologie in Berlin Jg 54, N F Bd 13 Bibliographie 1933 *Berlin*. de Gruyter, 1936. 262 pp M. 17.

Jahresbericht über die wissenschaftlichen Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete des neueren deutschen Literatur Hrsg im Auftr d Preuss Akad d Wiss. von der Literaturarchiv-Ges in Berlin N F Bd 13 Bibliographie 1933 *Berlin* de Gruyter, 1936 268 pp M 17.

Jud, Hildegardis. — Zur Wortkunst Heinrich Federers Eine stilkritische Untersuchung Diss *Freiburg, Schweiz*: 1935 116 pp

Keller, Marie V. — Der deutsche Expressionismus im Drama seiner Hauptvertreter *Weimar* Bohlau, 1936 viii, 66 pp M 3

Koplowitz, Oskar. — Otto Brahm als Theaterkritiker Mit Berücksichtigung seiner literarhist Arbeiten [Basler Beiträge zur deutschen Literatur- u Geistesgeschichte. Bd 3] *Leipzig*. Niehans, 1936. viii, 216 pp M 670

Krogmann, Willy. — Deutsch Eine wortgeschichtliche Untersuchung [Deutsche Wortforschung. H. 1] *Berlin*. de Gruyter, 1936 108 pp. M. 6

Leonhardt, Elisabeth. — Die mysteriöse Balade in ihren Anfängen Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Geistesgeschichte im 18 Jh. Diss *Münster*. 1936 vi, 89 pp

Lorenzen, Hans. — Typen deutscher Anekdotenerzählung (Kleist—Hebel—Schafer) Diss. *Hamburg* 1935 60 pp

Lüdtke, Heinrich. — Goethe und das Altonaer Schrifttum [Niederelbingen Nr 9]. *Altona*: Lorenzen, 1936 30 pp M. 075

Maier, Rudolf Nikolaus. — Ruth Schumann, Wesen und Wandlung der lyrischen Form. Diss. *Frankfurt*. 1935. 110 pp.

Mattheus, Peter. — Krümel als Detektiv. Ed by H D Samuel. Authorized Edition.

New York Oxford Univ Press, 1936 64 pp \$0 30.

May, Karl.—Der Pfahlmann. Ed by L. J. Russon. Authorized Edition New York: Oxford Press, 1936 62 pp \$0 30

Meng, Heinrich.—Schillers Abhandlung über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung Prolegomena zu einer Typologie des Dichters [Wege zur Dichtung Bd 25] Leipzig Huber, 1936 239 pp M 6 80

Mertens, Heiner.—Die Form der deutschen Predigt bei Berthold von Regensburg Diss. Bonn Würzburg 1936 64 pp.

Meyer, Hans M.—Das Übersinnliche bei Hermann Stehr [Germanische Studien H 179] Berlin. Ebering, 1936 99 pp M 4

Nitschke, Dolorosa.—Studien zum Gottsuchertum in der schlesischen Literatur Diss. Freiburg, Schweiz. 1935 viii, 138 pp

Plehwé, Artur.—Johann George Scheffner Diss. Königsberg 1936 xv, 184 pp

Ramminger, Aug.—Die Gedankenwelt Melchior Meyr's Diss. München 1936 viii, 133 pp

Rasch, Wolf Dietrich.—Freundschaftskult und Freundschaftsdichtung im deutschen Schrifttum des 18. Jhs vom Ausgang des Barock bis zu Klopstock [Deu Vierteljahrschrift f Literaturwissenschaft u Geistesgeschichte Buchreihe Bd 21] Halle Niemeyer, 1936 x, 266 pp M 11.

Rast, Elisabeth.—Vergleich, Gleichnis, Metapher und Allegorie bei Konrad von Wunzburg Diss. Heidelberg. 1936. ix, 98 pp

Razum, Joh.—Wesensformung des deutschen Arbeiters Darstellung seines Bildungsstrebens an Hand der Arbeiterdichtung Diss. Frankfurt 1935 xi, 75 pp

Schneider, Ferd. Jos.—Christian Reuter Vortrag, gehalten bei der Eröffnung einer Sammlung zur Errichtung eines Reuter-Gedenksteins am 12. Mai 1936 [Hallische Universitätsreden 69]. Halle Niemeyer, 1936 29 pp M 1 20.

Schneider, Hilde.—Wilhelm Raabes Mittel der epischen Darstellung, mit e Vorwort von Prof. F. Hahne [Germanische Studien H 178 Diss. München] Berlin. Ebering, 1936 211 pp M 8 40

Schoppmann, Hugo.—Die Flurnamen des Kreises Soest Tl I [Zeitschr d Vereins für die Geschichte von Soest u d. Borde H 53 = Veröffentlichungen d. Volkskundlichen Kommission d. Provinzialinst f Westf. Landes- u. Volkskunde Reihe 4 Flurnamen Bd 1. Tl. 1]. Soest Rocholsche Buchdr. W. Jahn, 1936. xx, 322 pp. M. 4.

Schroeder, Samuel.—Amerika in der deutschen Dichtung von 1850 bis 1890. Diss. Heidelberg: 1934. 95 pp.

Stifter, Adalbert.—Briefe (Auswahl, hrsg. von Friedr. Seebaß) Tübingen: Wunderlich [1936] xxiii, 396 pp. M 5 50

Sturm, Wilh.—Die Ortsnamen Hessens. Etymol. Wbch. der Orts-, Berg- und Flußnamen der Volkstaates Hessen 3 verb. u. verm. Aufl. Giessen: Roth [1936] 88 pp. M 2 80

Trubners Deutsches Wörterbuch. Im Auftrag der Arbeitsgemeinschaft für deutsche Wortforschung hrsg. von Alfred Gotze. 2. Lieferung O-patzig (Bd 3, Lfg 1). Berlin: de Gruyter & Co, 1936. 64 pp 4°. M 1

Volks-Brockhaus, Der. Deutsches Sach- und Sprachwörterbuch für Schule und Haus. Vierte, verb. Aufl. 1936 Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, New York: F. S. Crofts & Co, 1936 viii, 793 pp Bound, \$1 50

Werkmeister, Wilhelm.—Der Stilwandel in deutscher Dichtung und Musik des 18. Jahrhunderts [Neue dt. Forschungen Abt. Musikwissenschaft Bd 4 Diss. Göttingen]. Berlin Junker u. Dunnhaupt, 1936. 143 pp M 6 30

Wieschemann, Heiner.—Das Ethos in den Romanen Otto Ludwigs Diss. Münster: 1936 59 pp

Wilde, Heinz.—Die Zeitfolge in Thomas Murneis "Narrenbeschwörung" und "Schelmenzunft" Diss. Frankfurt 1935 64 pp

Winkler, Karl.—Heimatsprachkunde des Altbayerisch-Oberpfälzischen Kallmünz: Laßleben, 1936 253 pp M. 6

Zander, Tony.—Der Volksbildner Jeremias Gotthelf Diss. Frankfurt. 1936 72 pp

FRENCH

Augier et Sandeau.—Le Gendre de M. Poirier, ed. C. C. Webster Boston: Heath, 1936 xxvi + 140 pp. \$0.72.

Blackert, H.—Der Aufbau der Kunstwerklichkeit bei M. Proust Marburg diss. Berlin: Junker & Dunnhaupt, 1935. 133 pp

Bock, M.—Symbolistisches in den Dramen von A. de Musset Diss. Munich. 1936 71 pp

Daudet, A.—Lettres de mon Moulin, ed. E. B. Williams. New York: Macmillan, 1936 viii + 121 pp

De Carli, A.—Chateaubriand, prototipo del superuomo romantico. Imola: Gascari, 1935 vii + 127 pp

Dehm, Chr.—Studien zu Rutebeuf Diss. Würzburg: 1935 68 pp.

Dyke and Cure.—Outlined Stories for oral work in French. Boston: Heath, 1936. 64 pp. \$0.40.

Flasche, H.—Die begriffliche Entwicklung des Wortes *ratio* und seiner Ableitungen im

Französischen bis 1500 *Leipzig* · Rom Sem., 1935 275 pp

Ginzl, W.—Puget de La Serre Diss *Rostock* 1935 96 pp

Grammaire Larousse du XX^es, avec la collab. de F GaiFFE, E Maille etc *Paris* Larousse, 1936 467 pp Fr 16

Gregg, F.—Portrait de la poésie fr au XIX^es *Paris*. Delagrave, 1936 216 pp

Guiet, R.—L'Évolution d'un genre le livret d'opéra en Fr de Gluck à la Révolution (1774-93) *Northampton* Smith Coll., 1936 iv + 199 pp (Smith Studies, XVIII, 1-4)

Hellweg, M.—Der Begriff des Gewissens bei J-J Rousseau *Marburg* 1935 126 pp

Jansen, F. J. B.—Sources vives de la pensée de Montaigne *Copenhagen*. Levin & Munksgaard, 1935.

Klaus, H.—La Bruyère Mensch und Gesellschaft in seinen "Charakteren" Diss *Berlin* 1935 95 pp

Kruger, P.—Fransk litterær Kritik indtil 1830 *Copenhagen* Levin & Munksgaard, 1936 viii + 304 pp Kr 10

Kunze, H.—Die Bibelübersetzungen von Lefèvre d'Étaples und von P R Olivetan, verglichen in ihrem Wortschatz *Leipzig* Rom Sem, 1935 95 pp

Lancier, E.—Kind und junger Mensch in den Werken A Daudets Diss *Münster*, 1935. 151 pp

Larwill, P. H.—La théorie de la traduction au début de la Renaissance Diss *Munich*: 1934. 64 pp

Latronico, N.—L'allevamento e l'educazione del fanciullo nel pensiero innovatore di Fr. Rabelais *Milan*: Varietas, 1935 60 pp.

Leroy, O.—A Dictionary of Fr Slang *London*: Harrap, 1935 240 pp

Maupassant, G. de.—Six Contes choisis, ed F B Barton *Boston*. Heath, 1936. viii + 79 pp. \$0 40.

Mercaldo, M.—Le sens chrétien dans l'œuvre baudelaire *Salerno*. Spadafora, 1935. 19 pp

Naumann, W.—Der Sprachgebrauch Mallarmé's *Marburg*. Bauer, 1936 xx + 230 pp

Neri, F.—Appunti di letteratura francese, 1934-5. *Turin* · Viretto, 1935 155 pp

Pagnol, P.—Topaze, ed A G Bovée *Boston* Heath, 1936. iv + 243 pp. \$1 00.

Reinholdt, H.—Die moralischen religiösen und sozialen Ideen in den Romanen F. Souliés Diss. *Münster*: 1935 72 pp.

Rideout, B. L.—The Medical Practitioner in the Fr Novel 1850-90 Abstract of Cornell diss. *Ithaca*: 1936. 4 pp.

Royer, L.—Bibliog stendhalienne, 1934-5. *Grenoble*: Allier, 1936 24 pp Fr 12

Schmid, O J.—Subjectives und objektives Denken im französischen Wortschatz Diss *Munich* · 1936 vi + 41 pp

Schmidt, M.—Mme de Sévigné und das öffentliche Leben ihrer Zeit Diss *Munich*: 1935 72 pp.

Schwabbauer, W.—Lamartines "Graziella" Beziehungen zwischen Autor und Werk Diss. *Münster* · 1934 83 pp

Sommer, E.—Bergsons Einfluss auf die französische Schriftsprache. Diss *Munich* · 1935 xiv + 297 pp

Stakemann, J. G.—Voltaire, Wegbereiter der franz Revolution *Berlin*: Deutsche Kultur-Wacht, 1935 278 pp

Voigt, W.—Colette Diss *Jena*, 1935 101 pp

Wartburg, W. von — Die Ausgliederung der romanischen Sprachräume Diss *Halle* · Niemeyer, 1935 48 pp.

Watrin, E.—Die weltanschaulichen Grundlagen der Introd. à la vie dévote des hl Fr de Sales u die Auswirkung des Buches auf Werke der frz Lit des 17 Jhr Diss *Münster* · 1935 v + 98 pp

Willers, H.—Le Diable boiteux, El Diablo cojuelo. Diss *Rostock*. 1935.

Wloka, Br.-W.—Die moralpädagogischen u psychologischen Grundlagen der franz Rhétorique-Bücher des 17 u 18 Jahrh Diss *Breslau*. 1935. 128 pp

ITALIAN

Alfieri, Vittorio.—La vita. Introduzione e commento di M Lombardi Lotti *Torino* G B Paravia e C., 1935 xxxii + 375 pp. L 10 (Biblioteca di classici italiani)

—Saul, Agamennone, Oreste, Bruto Secondo, Filippo Tragedie Con introduzione di A Farinelli *Torino*: G B Paravia e C., 1935 xxvii + 237 pp L 7 (Biblioteca di classici italiani)

Alighieri, Dante.—La Divina Commedia commentata da G A Venturi II Purgatorio. *Milano* C. Signorelli, 1935 207 pp L 5.

Angelelli, O.—El dialetto fabbrianese Scenette popolari dal vero, con l'aggiunta di alcuni sonetti dialettali di diversi autori. *Fabriziano* · Tip Gentile, 1935. 36 pp

Annali della Cattedra petrarchesca I-V *Arezzo*: R Accademia Petrarca, 1930-1935 6 vols., 155; xiv + 162; xix + 126; x + 212, 210, viii + 196 pp

Annuario del teatro italiano Anno I 1 gennaio 1934, XII-31 maggio 1935, XIII. Prefazione di D. Alfieri. *Roma*: Soc. ital. autori ed editori, 1935. vii + 476 pp.

Bernini, F., e Bianchi, L.—Antologia della lirica moderna. Con elementi di ritmica e metrica. Per le scuole medie. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1935 356 pp L. 10.

Bianconi, P.—Pascoli. *Brescia*: Morcelliana, 1935. 249 pp L. 10

Borghese, G.—Bibliografia piemontese-ligure Serie seconda, nn 5001-10248. Vol I *Torino*. 1935. vii + 766 pp L. 40 (Biblioteca della Soc storica subalpina diretta da A Tallone, CXLIX)

Borzelli, A.—Fabrizio Marotta poeta tra il XVI e il XVII secolo *Napoli*: Tip degli Artigianelli, 1935 25 pp

—Note intorno a Margherita Sarrocchi ed al suo poema "La Scanderbeide" *Napoli*: Tip degli Artigianelli, 1935 60 pp.

Busetto, N.—Giosuè Carducci nel suo tempo e nella sua poesia. *Roma*. Albrighi, Segati e C, 1935 xii + 411 pp L. 16

Capasso, A.—Poeti di ieri *Firenze*. Ed di Solaria, 1935 132 pp. L. 8

Carducci, Giosue.—Prose scelte. Con introduzioni e note a cura di L. Bianchi e P. Nediani *Bologna* N. Zanichelli, 1935 362 pp L. 10

Carinci, N.—La struttura dell'Inferno dantesco e la visione delle anime dei dannati. Esposizione sintetica della prima cantica della Divina Commedia *Lavagna* Tip. Artigianelli, 1935 60 pp (Studi danteschi)

Celebrazioni marchigiane Parte I 16-31 agosto 1934-XII Parte II 1-16 settembre 1934-XII Prefazione di A. Pavolini *Urbino* R. Ist d'arte per la decorazione e la illustrazione del libro, 1935. 2 vols, iii + 617, 461 pp L. 60

Cellini, Benvenuto.—La vita. Note di G. Valori. *Milano*: "Ite," Ist tip editoriale, 1935. 292 pp L. 5. (Collana di autobiografie dei più illustri uomini del mondo, diretta da G. Valori, 1.)

Chiurlo, B.—Pieri Corvât (Pietro Michellini), l'uomo e il poeta. Lettura tenuta all'Accademia di Udine *Udine*: Arti graf. friulane, 1935 43 pp.

Crosara, A.—Il rinnovamento letterario e le conquiste della dottrina fascista. Lezione. *Venezia*: Tip Commerciale, 1935 23 pp

Curcio, S.—Punti di vista. *Roma* "Quaterni dell'arciere," 1935. 63 pp. L. 4.

De Lisa, G.—La poesia di Guido Gozzano *Brindisi*: Tip del Commercio di V. Ragione, 1935. 101 pp. L. 6

De Sanctis, Francesco.—Storia della letteratura italiana *Firenze*: A. Salani, 1935 2 vols, 511, 520 pp. L. 5 each volume (I Classici, edizione Fiorentina, 106-107)

De Sanctis, G. B.—L'Innominato e la sua notte. Lettura-saggio manzoniano (C. XXI

I Pr. Sp.). *Portoferraro*: Tip Elbana G. Sassi, 1935 41 pp L. 250

Ercole, F.—Romanticismo e classicismo nella poesia di Giosue Carducci *Palermo*. F. Ciuni, 1935 98 pp. L. 7.

Fattorello, F.—Carducci e il Friuli. *Udine*: Arti graf. Friulane, 1935 35 pp L. 4 (Accademia di Udine Fondazione A. di Prampero Collezione di monografie e studi friulani, III)

Fiorentino, F.—Ritratti storici e saggi critici raccolti da G. Gentile. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1935. vi + 361 pp L. 25.

—Onoranze a — nel cinquantenario della sua morte. *Napoli*: Tip Torella e figlio, 1935 119 pp.

Fogazzaro, Antonio.—Leila. Romanzo. Edizione a cura di P. Nardi *Milano-Venezia*: A. Mondadori, 1935 603 pp L. 5. (I libri azzurri, n. 17)

Fusco, E. M.—Gli usignuoli e un viandante. Notazioni letterarie *Milano*: "Ite," Ist. tip editoriale, 1935. 159 pp. L. 8. (Aspetti dell'idealismo contemporaneo, I)

Giusti, Giuseppe.—Poesie e prose. Scelte e annotate da G. Mazzoni *Bologna*. N. Zanichelli, 1935 viii + 163 pp. L. 8

Goldoni, Carlo.—La famiglia dell'antiquario. Commedia in tre atti. Con introduzione e note di A. Servi *Lanciano*: G. Carabba, 1935 135 pp L. 4 (Classici italiani e stranieri)

—Le donne curiose. Commedia in tre atti con introduzione e commento di E. Alodoli. *Palermo-Milano*: R. Sandron, 1935. viii + 87 pp. L. 2.

—Un curioso accidente. Commedia in tre atti. Con introduzione e note di A. Servi. *Lanciano*. G. Carabba, 1935 95 pp. L. 3 (Classici italiani e stranieri)

Gravina, M.—Scritti, ordinati e presentati da T. Sillani. Prefazione di L. Federzoni. *Roma*. "La rassegna italiana," 1935 xx + 569 pp L. 30

Gregorio Tifernate.—Tre carmi dal latino di — Poeticamente tradotti col testo a fronte per la prima volta in Italia da V. Corbucci *Città di Castello*. Scuola tip. Orfanelli S. Cuore, 1935 47 pp L. 2.

Grossi, Tommaso.—Marco Visconti. Storia del Trecento cavata dalle cronache di quel secolo e raccontata da —. Ristampa della 1a edizione del 1834, con uno studio di G. Bertacchi *Milano*: Ceschina, 1935 542 pp. L. 10.

Guardione, F.—Giacomo Leopardi *Palermo* G. Travi, 1935. 351 pp L. 20.

Lepore, G.—Dante e l'Etiopia. Con lettera proemiale di G. Semmla *Portici*: Tip. Bellavista, 1935. 30 pp

Linati, Claudio, 1790-1832. L'epistolario,

le poesie politiche di — e scritti di vari autori su — *Parma*: Tip. già Cooperativa, 1935 viii + 355 pp. L. 20 (Memorie Parmensi per la storia del Risorgimento, IV)

Medici, De', Lorenzino — L'apologia — Bibboni, F., L'ammazzamento di — Prefazione e note di G. Valori *Milano* "Ite," Istituto tipografico editoriale, 1935 101 pp. L. 5 (Collana di autobiografie dei più illustri uomini del mondo, diretta da G. Valori)

Metastasio, Pietro. — *Attilio Regolo* Melodramma in tre atti. Con introduzione, commenti e note a cura di G. Bonfiglioli *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1935 111 pp. L. 3.50. (I grandi scrittori)

Montera, P. de. — L'humanisme napolitain. Girolamo Carbone et ses poésies inédites *Napoli*: R. Ricciardi, 1935 lx-xxix + 84 pp. L. 16 (Pubblicazioni della Scuola di perfezionamento in lingue e letterature moderne della Università di Napoli, I)

Naselli, Carmelina. — Studi di letteratura antica siciliana. *Catania*. V. Muglia, 1935. 147 pp. L. 12

Pasquini, E. — Cecco Frate (Francesco Donati). Giosuè Carducci e Francesco Donati suo maestro e guida, il Donati poeta; ecc. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1935 113 pp. L. 9

Perroni Grande, L. — Bibliografia dantesca messinese *Reggio Calabria*. Tip. "Fata Morgana," 1935 213 pp.

Poggolini, O. — Giosuè Carducci. Discorso *Firenze*: "Argo," 1935. 12 pp.

Raya, G. — Francesco De Sanctis. *Palermo*: F. Ciuni, 1935 246 pp. L. 13.

Risorgimento, II, nell'opera di Giosuè Carducci. Prefazione di A. Manaresi *Roma*: Vittoriano, 1935 viii + 269 pp. L. 15. (R. Istituto per la storia del Risorgimento italiano. Biblioteca scientifica, II serie; Memorie, III)

Rosina, T. — Federico Tozzi. Saggio critico. Prefazione di O. Vergani. *Genova*: E. Degli Orfini, 1935 226 pp. L. 10 (Collezione degli scrittori nuovi, diretta da A. Capasso, 20)

Rossetti, G. — La Beatrice di Dante. Ragionamenti critici. A cura di Maria Luisa Giartosio De Courten. Con prefazione di B. Giuliano. *Imola*: P. Galeati, 1935 xiii + 608 pp.

Siciliano, I. — Medio Evo e Rinascimento *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1936 159 pp. L. 15. (Biblioteca della Rassegna, XIX.)

Sorrentino, A. — La letteratura italiana e il Sant'Uffizio. Vol. I. *Napoli*: F. Perrella, 1935. 378 pp. L. 18.

Tasso, Torquato. — La Gerusalemme liberata. Testo integrale con breve commento ad ogni canto. *Firenze*: G. Nerbini, 1934. 4to., 307 pp. L. 20.

Turazza, A. — Laura e Petrarca. Voci della lirica tedesca da Klopstock a George, recate in italiano da — *Bologna*. Tip. Azzoguidi, 1935 27 pp. (Per le nozze di Teresa Bianchi e Clemente Gualandini)

Vidari, G. — Manzoni. *Torino*: Soc. edit. Internazionale, 1935 253 pp. L. 10.

Virdia, F. — Rapporto sulle lettere *Ascoli Piceno*. Soc. tipo-litografica, 1935 53 pp. L. 250 (Quaderni di Eja, 1)

Visconti, F. — "Dogali" di Alfredo Oriani. Discorso *Avellino*: Tip. Ferrara, 1935. 22 pp.

SPANISH

Caravaca, F. — Pi y Margall. *Barcelona*: Juventud, 1935.

Casis, Switzer, and Harrison. — El Mundo español. 2 vols. *Boston*: Heath, 1936. xvi + 458 + xvi + 482 pp.

Cassou, J. — Cervantes. *Paris*: Eds sociales internationales, 1936. 245 pp. Fr. 12.

Forrester, Katharine T. and Kathleen D. Loly. — Vámos a México! *Boston*: Heath, 1936 viii + 102 pp.

Giera, A. — Tesor de la llengua, de la tradicions i de la cultura popular de Catalunya. I. A-Azocs. *Barcelona*: Catalunya, 1935.

Leavitt, S. E. — Hispano-American Literature in the U. S. a bibliog. of translations and criticisms. *Chapel Hill*: U. of N. C. Press, 1935.

Miscellània luliana. *Barcelona*: Altés, 1935.

Navarro-Tomás, T. — El Acento castellano. *Madrid*: Archivos, 1935.

Reding, K. P. — The Generation of 1898 in Spain as seen through its fictional hero. *Northampton*: Smith Coll., 1936. viii + 125 pp. (Smith Studies, XVII, 3, 4)

Rubio, A. — Comments on 18th Century Purismo. Part of a Chicago diss., 1935 16 pp.

Sponer, M. — Katalanische Mundarten. *Leipzig*: Harrassowitz, 1935 19 pp.

Weisser, F. — Sprachliche Kunstmittel des Erzpriesters von Hita. Part of diss. *Hamburg*: 1936.

Yurramendi, M. — Lope de Vega y la Teología. *Madrid*: Fax, 1935. 196 pp.

GENERAL

Etudes dédiées au quatrième congrès de linguistes. *Prague*: 1936 (Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague, 6)

Gottschalk, W. — Die Bildhaften Sprichwörter der Romanen. II. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1936. viii + 356 pp. M. 9 80

PMLA. Index (1884-1935). Ed. P. W. Long. *New York*: MLA, 1936 240 pp.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LII

FEBRUARY, 1937

Number 2

UN PASSAGE DE LOPE DE VEGA, L'ESPAGNOL *SEGULLO* ET L'ETYMOLOGIE DU FRANÇAIS *TALUS*

Au vers 562 du I^{er} acte de *Barlaán y Josafat* de Lope :

- 557· Naturaleza mui prudente andubo
 en esconder profundamente el oro
 Por las ondas entrañas entretubo
 sus ricas venas y real decoro
 de los excelsos montes que preserba,
562 y encima, por señal, puso una yerba

l'éditeur M. Montesinos (*Teatro antiguo español* VIII [1935] p. 275)
met la note suivante :

Lope debe aludir aquí a alguna vieja fábula botánica, de la que no he encontrado rastro en ninguno de los libros que he consultado. Nada encuentro en Plinio, ni a propósito del oro ni de ninguna de las plantas—numerosas—cuyo nombre se compone con la base *chryso*-. Los antiguos tratadistas de minería, como, por ejemplo, Alonso Barba, tampoco dan razón de esta hierba, que tanta búsqueda infructuosa ahoraría a los mineros. Tal vez se trate de alguna conseja popular de que no queda constancia literaria.

Ayant lu dans le *Dictionnaire des superstitions* de Chesnel (1856) un article sur l'*herbe d'or*, qui chez les Bretons est censée donner à celui qui la cueille pieds nus, en chemise, sans la couper avec le fer, l'entendement du langage des animaux, et que l'auteur identifie avec le *selago* de Pline, *Historia naturalis* 24, 103, livre que je ne pouvais consulter à Istanbul, je me suis adressé au professeur Georg Rohde, le latinisant de l'Université de Marbourg, maintenant à Ankara, pour savoir au juste ce que Pline en dit. Voici la réponse nourrie de suggestions bien fondées et de raisonnements perspicaces :

An der von Ihnen angegebenen Stelle handelt es sich nicht um ein Kraut, das das Vorhandensein von Gold anzeigt, sondern um eines, das gegen alle

Krankheiten hilft und das unter Beobachtung bestimmter Ceremonien ausgegraben werden muss. Hingegen habe ich 33, 21, 67 etwas gefunden, was vielleicht in Frage kommt; die Stelle heisst „aurum qui quaerunt, ante omnia segutilum tollunt, ita vocatur indicium“ [angeblich soll es heute noch ein von *segutilum* stammendes spanisches Wort geben, das die über der goldführenden Schicht liegende Erdschicht bezeichnet] „alveus hic est harenae, quae lavatur, atque ex eo, quod resedit, coniectura capitur. invenitur aliquando in summa tellure protinus rara felicitate, ut nuper in Delmatia principatu Neronis singulis diebus etiam quinquagenas libras fundens cum ita inventum est in summo caespite, talutium vocant, si et aurosa tellus subest cetero montes Hispaniarum, aridi sterilesque et in quibus nihil aliud gignatur, huic bono fertiles esse coguntur“ Bei *cum ita inventum est* besteht eine Unsicherheit der Ueberlieferung: *cum iam, cumina, cummina, gummi* (ein Toletanus hat ubrigens *cumina*); das scheint mir darauf zu führen, dass dort in der Tat ein Appellativum gestanden hat; natürlich kann eine Konjunktion nicht gut gefehlt haben. Das Ganze muss einmal geheissen haben. „wenn x gefunden worden ist oben auf dem Rasen, und es ist dann auch wirklich goldhaltige Erde darunter, so nennt man dieses x *talutium*“ So wie der Satz jetzt in den Ausgaben steht, gibt er ja keinen Sinn; danach musste das gefundene Gold selbst *talutium* heissen; andersseits ist aber doch gerade die Rede davon, dass die *aurosa tellus* unter dem *talutium* ist . . . Verdachtig scheint es mir jedenfalls, dass hier die spanischen Gebirge genannt sind mit *huic bono* kann eigentlich nur das *talutium* gemeint sein, von dem man nicht weiss, was es ist, das aber leicht als ein Gewächs irgendwelcher Art aufgefasst werden kann.

Pour moi il n'y a aucun doute que M. Rohde a vu juste et que Lope s'est souvenu, peut-être à travers des intermédiaires dont nous ne savons rien, du passage de Pline¹ cité par M. Rohde: le *talutium*, quoi qu'il ait été pour Pline, est pour Lope la *yerba* „au-dessus“ de la montagne, „indice“ du métal précieux: la correspondance entre *in summo caespite—subest—indicium et encima—ondas entrañas (esconder profundamente)—señal* est formelle. Notre passage se rattache d'ailleurs à la philosophie médiévale du „potentiel“ (*in potentia*) cachant en soi le réel (*in actu*) et aussi à cette conception du monde ne consistant qu'en signes révélant une vérité (religieuse ou morale) cachée, que j'ai signalée dans *ZRP*h. LIV, p. 240 à l'occasion d'expressions fréquentes chez l'Arcipreste de Hita comme:

*So la espina yaze la rrosa, noble flor;
So fea letra yaze saber de grand dolor*

¹ La connaissance de Pline par Lope est prouvée par le v. 911, qui cite le *aegophthalmos* de Pline, cf. Montesinos.

(cf. encore Claudel, *Positions et Propositions* II, p. 160: "Le poisson [dans la figuration du Christ par $\iota\chi\theta\upsilon\varsigma$] est sous le pain, comme la substance est sous les espèces en apparences").

Quant au mot *segutulum* "la manne" (d'or), l'esp. *segullo* se trouve dans nos dictionnaires depuis Oudin: je lis dans l'édition de 1675 du *Tesoro de dos lenguas* . *segullo* "La première terre qui est sur les mines d'or," alors que Nebrija a dans la partie latine-espagnole de son vocabulaire . *segullum* [autre leçon de *segutulum* dans le passage de Pline] "La señal de la vena del oro," avec mention expresse du passage de Pline. Depuis, Salvá a fait entrer le mot espagnol dans l'édition de 1865 de son *Diccionario*, et le dictionnaire latin-allemand de Georges ainsi que le REW, Ernout-Meillet etc. répètent l'équation. esp. *segullo* = lat. *segutulum* (*segullum*). Ni le dictionnaire de l'Académie espagnole ni Slabý-Grossmann ne portent plus ce mot. J'ai donc des doutes assez forts au sujet de la vitalité de ce *segullo* prétendu espagnol (qui ne serait pas développé phonétiquement, cf. *viejo*) et qui sera, je crois, un latinisme ou plutôt un "plinisme," une adaptation espagnolisante de la leçon si répandue *segullum*. Enfin, si le raisonnement de M. Rohde est juste, *talutium* est cet x dont les montagnes incultes de l'Espagne foisonnent et qui est l'indice de l'or (peut-être une plante)—mais alors comment concilier avec ce mot le fr *talus*? M. Jud (*Rom.* XLVII, p. 487, dans son article "Mots d'origine gauloise?" dont je retiens, avec feu Sainéan, le ton dubitatif) émet l'hypothèse d'un radical gaulois *talo-* signifiant "front, limite, bande de gazon du bout de champ," qui pourrait expliquer et le *talutium* dans le passage de Pline qu'il cite textuellement (en interprétant: *cum (aurum) inventum est . . .* "l'or trouvé *in summo caespite* . . . au "front de la terre," dénommé donc avec raison: *aurum talutium*"), le *talutium* médiéval (Du Cange) signifiant "cerce le plus près [l. proche?] du fond d'un tonneau" et le *talus* français. M. Jud donne donc une explication par le gaulois à un *hapax* de Pline dont le sens—les hésitations des mss. en font foi—n'est pas encore bien établi, et M. Meyer-Lübke d'abandonner aussitôt (REW*) devant cette construction son ancienne étymologie beaucoup plus simple et plus convaincante (REW¹⁻²): fr. *talus* dérivé de lat. *talus* "talon" (cf. all. *Talsole*)! Ces savants n'ont pas tenu compte de la tradition manuscrite du texte latin et du sens du passage: il y a loin de l'assurance qu'affiche l'assertion du REW*:

"Das gall. Wort, das wohl von *talos* "Stirne" . . . abgeleitet ist, begegnet bei Plinius, in der Bedeutung "Bezeichnung des Goldes, das dicht an der Oberfläche liegt," à la réalité beaucoup plus problématique.² Une attitude plus critique et plus philologique serait nécessaire au linguiste.³

LEO SPITZER

The Johns Hopkins University

² Vaille que vaille, je préférerais encore à *talutum* = gaul. **tal-* 'front' une équation *talutum* (= *talucum*, Jud) = grec *ταλύσιος* (*ἄπρος*) 'das aus dem ersten Korn der neuen Ernte gebackene Brot' (Pape), pour ainsi dire les primeurs qui précèdent les autres fruits (*θαλύσια* 'les primeurs offertes à la fête de la récolte,' de *θάλλειν* 'fleurir, s'épanouir') Cf pour le caractère poétique l'expression française *manne d'or*, rappelant la manne de Dieu biblique. On s'expliquerait dans cette hypothèse l'opinion de Lope (et probablement d'autres avant lui) qu'il s'agirait d'une *plante*

³ J'ajoute quelques remarques sur le texte de *Barlaán y Josafat* établi par M. Montesinos

Barlaan No la[la pierre la plus précieuse] ven
sino los que castos son
y limpios de corazón.

911 Zardan: Pocos le verán también.

L'éditeur suppose le sens 'entonces' pour *también*, mais il ne réussit pas à le documenter. On pourrait alléguer le parallèle français *aussi bien* [ne la verront-ils pas].

1410 *viejo anciano* semble "bastante torpe" à l'éditeur. Ce sera tout simplement un archaïsme parallèle à *vieil antif* d'*Aucassin et Nicolette*, *xi*, 5, formule très courante en a. franc. d'après Herm. Sauter, *Wortgut und Dichtung* (Thèse de Munster 1934) p. 76, qui cite aussi *vieil ancien*

Apéndice.	145 Las scilas de aquí se ven
	en mejor árbol de nave;
	aquí de su voz suave
	celebra el alma también.

L'éditeur corrige *celebra* des deux textes imprimés en *se libra*: dans cette hypothèse *su voz suave* serait celle des *Scilas*, confondues avec les Sirènes? Si l'on traduit *celebra* par 'chante des louanges, exulte,' le texte pourrait rester inaltéré. Pour le groupement des sirènes avec Scylla et Charybde voir le passage d'Abélard dans la traduction de Mlle Charrier, "Héloïse" p. 292: "Fort de cet appui salutaire [la foi], je ne crains pas les aboie-

THE HISTORICAL SETTING OF ROBERT VEEZ
DE PERRON

The chanson *Robert veez de Perron* of Thibaut de Champagne is of considerable historical interest, and a number of scholars have striven to place it against the proper background.¹ While M. Vignerat in a recent article has corrected the errors which were made by M. Wallenskold in his edition of Thibaut's works, his own conclusions are far from satisfactory.² In this poem Count Thibaut expresses to a companion named Robert his indignation that Perron, who has a traitor's heart and a thief's face, has promised his lovely daughter to a *si loigtaing baron*. Three facts are strongly implied though not definitely stated—that Thibaut has the power to prevent the marriage, that he knows and admires the lady, and that Robert is more fully acquainted than Thibaut with Perron's reasons for his action.

There seems to be no reasonable doubt that Perron was Peter of Dreux, duke of Brittany, whose daughter, Yolande, was successively

ments de Scylla, je ris du gouffre de Charybde, je n'ai pas peur du chant mortel des Sirènes."

414 "La frase debe de estar viciada. Quizá el autor de estos versos quiso hacer disparatar a Bato, y lo consiguió de manera que el disparate, con la colaboración del impresor, ha llegado a ser incomprensible." Je ne trouve pas d'embrouillement dans ces vers: Bato polémique contre les 'ermites de cour et de la place publique' (cf. la réponse de Josafat 433 *que muchos santos aurá / en la plaza y en el templo*) et oppose à la véritable sainteté de Josafat, qui a abandonné la puissance pour être pauvre 'ici' (*aquí* v 404), dans le désert, ces faux saints qui n'ont aucun mérite à se faire ermites à la cour, si par cela ils réussissent à partager la table avec les puissants: le *yo* des v 409, 411, et le *me* de 416 n'est qu'un 'moi exemplificatif' ('si j'ai, par exemple, une brebis ou que je sois paysan . . . , est-ce que je fais .')

Le v 414 *sólo en casado y sayal* contient une allusion au costume de moine de ce faux-frère: en bure (*sayal*) et en chasuble (*casulla*, altéré en *casado*, comme tous les mots d'église, par le *bobo* Bato, qui est 'maridé' et ne se plaint pas trop d'avoir perdu sa femme).

v. 529 la virgule à la fin du vers doit être biffée.

¹ J. Raynaud, *Bibliographie des chansonniers français des XIII^e et XIV^e siècles* (Paris, 1884), no. 1878. *Les chansons de Thibaut de Champagne, roi de Navarre* (ed. A. Wallenskold, *Société des anciens textes français*, Paris, 1925), no. 50.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 175-176. L. A. Vignerat, *MLN.*, XLVIII (1933), 336-338.

promised to King Henry III of England (in October 1226 and again in 1231), John of Anjou, younger brother of King Louis IX of France (in March 1227), Thibaut himself (in 1231 or 1232), and Hugh de Lusignan, son of the count of La Marche, whom she married in 1236.³ Philippe Mouskés, an excellent contemporary source, states that Yolande was affianced to Richard of Cornwall, brother of Henry III, in 1226, but he probably confused the two brothers.⁴ M. Wallenskold, who was, apparently, unaware of Yolande's engagement to Henry III, believed that Richard of Cornwall was the distant baron. M. Vignerat, however, pointed out the weakness of a conclusion based on Mouskés alone in the face of positive evidence that Yolande was affianced to Henry III in October, 1226, and gave plausible reasons for refusing to accept so early a date for the chanson. While it is impossible to disprove M. Wallenskold's identification, one can only agree with Vignerat that it is extremely improbable.

Unfortunately, when M. Vignerat began to construct his own setting for the poem, he plunged into new difficulties. He believed that the *loigtaing baron* was Hugh de Lusignan. Now it is hard to see how Thibaut could call Hugh a distant baron. Hugh's father, the count of La Marche, had been a close ally of Thibaut in 1226 and 1227, and his lands lay only about fifty miles from the southernmost fiefs held of the count of Champagne.⁵ Then the marriage of Yolande and Hugh in 1236 was part of a general baronial alliance of which Thibaut was the central figure. The count of Champagne was attempting to wrest from King Louis the counties of Blois and Chartres. In January, 1236, he married his daughter Blanche to

³ *Patent rolls 1225-1232 (Rolls series)*, pp. 153-154. *Close rolls 1231-1234 (Rolls series)*, p. 151. *Layettes du trésor des chartes* (ed. Alexandre Teulet, Paris, 1866), II, no. 1922. *Registres de Grégoire IX* (ed. Lucien Auvray, *Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*, second series), no. 789. Dom Hyacinthe Morice, *Mémoires pour servir de preuves à l'histoire ecclésiastique et civile de Bretagne* (Paris, 1742), I, 111.

⁴ Philippe Mouskés, *Chronique rimée*, v. 27562-27566, *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, XXII, 42. It is impossible to accept Vignerat's suggestion that Mouskés confused Richard and Hugh de Lusignan as he is clearly describing the events of 1226-1227. Richard of Cornwall was in Poitou in 1225-1227, and it is possible that Yolande was promised to him before the arrangement with Henry III in October 1226.

⁵ Morice, *Preuves*, I, 856-857.

John, son of Peter of Brittany.⁶ At about the same time Yolande's marriage to Hugh made La Marche and Brittany allies.⁷ On April 13, 1236, the count of La Marche swore that if any one attacked Thibaut, he would support him in any way Peter might suggest.⁸ Thus the baronial league that Thibaut relied on to assist him against the king was based on the marriages of "Perron's" two children. It is inconceivable that under these circumstances Thibaut would have written a chanson which insulted both his allies and protested against a marriage that was for his own benefit.

It is, however, possible to supply a background for this poem which is quite satisfactory. Yolande was promised to John of Anjou in the spring of 1227.⁹ As John's mother, the queen regent Blanche of Castille, distrusted the duke of Brittany, she insisted that Yolande be placed in the custody of a baronial committee consisting of her two paternal uncles—Count Robert of Dreux and Henry of Dreux, archbishop of Reims,—Philip, count of Boulogne, and the lords of Coucy and Montmorency. In case the pope were to forbid the marriage, these barons were to guard Yolande until John was fourteen years old.¹⁰ In May, 1227, Pope Gregory IX banned the proposed union.¹¹ Thus when Count Thibaut's second wife, Agnes, died in July, 1231, Yolande was technically free to marry, and her person was in the care of her guardians, all of whom except the count of Boulogne were neighbors of the count of Champagne.¹² Now during the years 1227-1231 a bitter feud had raged between Thibaut and the house of Dreux.¹³ Hence it seemed wise to Yolande's guardians to restore peace by marrying her to the count of Champagne. Indeed only a royal messenger bearing King Louis' express prohibition prevented the wedding

⁶ Aubri de Trois Fontaines, *Chronicon, Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores*, xxiii, 938. *Layettes du trésor des chartes*, II, no. 2432.

⁷ Morice, *Preuves*, I, 111.

⁸ *Layettes du trésor des chartes*, II, no. 2443.

⁹ *Ibid.*, no. 1922.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* J. Levron, "Catalogue des actes de Pierre de Dreux, duc de Bretagne," *Mémoires de la société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Bretagne*, XI (1930), no. 114.

¹¹ *Registres de Grégoire IX*, nos. 87, 88.

¹² Aubri de Trois Fontaines, *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores*, xxiii, 929.

¹³ Élie Berger, *Histoire de Blanche de Castille, reine de France* (Paris, 1895), pp. 144-160, 186-193.

from taking place.¹⁴ Meanwhile late in July, 1231, the duke of Brittany, "Perron," had paid a visit to Henry III in England. He had persuaded that monarch to give up his plan to marry a sister of the king of Scotland and to renew his promise to wed Yolande.¹⁵ In short, while Yolande's guardians were planning to marry her to Count Thibaut, her father was offering her hand to Henry III.

The conclusion that Henry III was the distant baron and that the chanson was written between the death of Thibaut's second wife in July, 1231, and his marriage to Margaret of Bourbon in March, 1233, seems to be consistent with all the indications contained in the poem.¹⁶ The fact that Thibaut was relying on his marriage to Yolande to restore peace between him and his neighbors would account for his highly uncomplimentary remarks about Peter. Since Yolande had passed four years in the vicinity of his lands, Thibaut had had an opportunity to see and admire her. He could prevent her marriage to Henry, the distant baron, by wedding her himself. Furthermore this setting for the chanson suggests the identity of Robert. Count Robert of Dreux was the head of Yolande's family and the chief of her guardians. The fact that he held his county of Braisne as a fief from the counts of Champagne made him a close, even if not always cordial, associate of Thibaut. He would certainly know more than Thibaut about Peter's reasons for wishing to marry Yolande to Henry III. Finally the situation described above furnishes a motive for the composition of the poem. Robert and Thibaut were planning to marry the latter to Yolande, and they knew that King Louis and his mother would object to an alliance between Champagne and Brittany. This chanson was written to justify their conspiracy in the eyes of their fellow barons.¹⁷

¹⁴ Jean, sire de Joinville, *Histoire de Saint Louis* (ed Natalis de Wailly, *Société de l'histoire de France*, Paris, 1868), p. 29. *Registres de Grégoire IX*, no 789

¹⁵ Roger of Wendover, *Flores historiarum* (ed. H. G. Hewlett, *Rolls series*), III, 15. *Close rolls 1231-1234*, p. 151.

¹⁶ M. Vigneras dismissed the possibility that Henry III was the distant baron on the ground that the title *baron* could not be applied to a king. A reviewer has expressed his doubts as to the soundness of the argument and pointed out that *baron* could mean simply husband. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, xxxv (1934), 77-78. I share these doubts.

¹⁷ On the use of chansons as propaganda in this period see Berger, *Blanche de Castille*, pp. 108-109.

In the castle-halls of France men would say that Thibaut had married Yolande to save her from exile to England.

SIDNEY PAINTER

The Johns Hopkins University

NOTES SUR GUILLAUME DE DOLE

I. L'EMPEREUR CONRAD. On sait que le principal personnage de *Guillaume de Dole* est l'empereur Conrad, à qui notre auteur attribue toutes les qualités requises du parfait chevalier et du monarque idéal. Pourquoi lui a-t-il donné ce nom, qui avait été précédemment porté par trois empereurs d'Allemagne?¹ Les critiques ont cru jusqu'ici qu'il n'y avait, entre ces trois souverains et le héros du roman, rien de commun que le nom.² Or, voici ce que nous lisons, dans une des nombreuses généalogies qui se trouvent dans la chronique d'Albéric de Troisfontaines:

Comes Hugo Cholez de sorore (ut dicitur) imperatoris Conradi genuit Wichardum novissimum et Hugonem, patrem Ebali de Bosco, cujus mater de Curia Landonis, et duas eorum sorores. Una Galchero de Montejai peperit Guidonem patrem comitis Galcheri de Sancto Paulo et Galcherum patrem Galcheri de Nantolio.³

Le dernier des personnages mentionnés ci-dessus, Gaucher de Nanteuil, était le frère de Miles de Nanteuil, évêque de Beauvais de 1217 à 1234,⁴ à qui Jean Renart a dédié son roman. Miles de Nanteuil était donc arrière-petit-fils d'Hugues Cholet, comte de Rouci, et arrière-petit-neveu de Conrad III. Albéric ne rapporte point le mariage d'Hugues Cholet avec la sœur de l'empereur comme un fait certain, mais plutôt comme une tradition orale (*ut dicitur*); il n'en est pas moins vrai que cette tradition était répandue à l'époque où vivaient les trois frères de Nanteuil, dans le premier tiers du XIII^e siècle.⁵ Ce n'est donc point sans raison que Jean

¹ Conrad de Franconie (911-918), Conrad II (1024-1039), Conrad III (1138-1152).

² Ch.-V. Langlois, *La vie en France au moyen âge* (Paris, 1926), I, 73.

³ MGSS, xxiii, 823-824

⁴ *Galila Christiana*, ix, 740.

⁵ La chronique d'Albéric se termine en 1241.

Renart a choisi le nom de Conrad, mais bien pour flatter l'orgueil démesuré de Miles de Nanteuil, *qui plus ot d'orgueil en li que n'ot Nabugodonosor, qui trop en ot.*⁶

II. LE COMTE DE CLERMONT. Dans le roman, l'empereur Conrad porte un écu aux armes du comte de Clermont:

Et si portoit l'escu demi
Au gentil comte de Clermont
Au lion rampant contremont
D'or et d'azur et d'autre part.⁷

Qui était ce comte de Clermont? Servois a supposé que c'était Guillaume Dauphin, comte de Clermont en Auvergne, dont le contre-sceau portait, en 1199 et 1206, deux lions passants:

Guillaume Dauphin, qui met deux lions sur l'un de ses sceaux, a pu se contenter ailleurs d'un seul, ne fût-ce que sur sa cotte d'armes ou la housse de son cheval, et le poète ne garder que le souvenir de la variante. Cela dit, je reconnaitrai que mon identification demeure incertaine. Je ne l'offre qu'avec réserve et jusqu'à meilleur avis.⁸

Mme Lejeune-Dehousse a pensé qu'il fallait corriger *Clermont* en *Beaumont*, les armes de ce dernier comté étant "d'azur au lion d'or."⁹ Ni Servois ni Mme Lejeune-Dehousse n'ont cru qu'il fût question ici du comté de Clermont-sur-Meuse, situé entre Huy et Liège, car, selon Jacques de Henricourt, les seigneurs de ce lieu avaient dans leurs armoiries, non pas un lion, mais un aigle.¹⁰ Telles étaient en effet leurs armes au XIV^e siècle; mais Jacques de Henricourt remarque aussi que les comtes de Clermont avaient eu autrefois les mêmes armes que ceux de Duras. Nous savons d'autre part qu'au XII^e siècle les comtes de Duras étaient aussi comtes de Clermont. Les deux comtés avaient été séparés en 1193, celui de Duras passant aux comtes de Looz, et celui de Clermont aux seigneurs de Walecourt.¹¹ Il semblerait donc que, pendant quelque temps après leur séparation, les deux comtés ont continué à avoir les mêmes armes. Or, le sceau et le contre-sceau dont se

⁶ *Récits d'un ménestrel de Reims*, ed. N. de Wailly (Paris, 1876), 88

⁷ *Le Roman de la Rose ou de Guillaume de Dole*, ed. Servois, "Société des anciens textes français" (Paris, 1893), vss 68-71 Cf. p. lxxxii.

⁸ *Ibid.*, introd., pp. lxxvii-lxxviii.

⁹ Rita Lejeune-Dehousse, *L'œuvre de Jean Renart* (Liège-Paris, 1935), 117-119.

¹⁰ *Miroir des nobles de Hesbaye*, ed. Bayot (Bruxelles, 1910), I, 146.

¹¹ Gislebert de Mons, *Chronicon Hanoniense*, MGSS., **xxi**, 567 et 585.

servant, en 1206, Louis II, comte de Looz et de Duras, nous ont été préservés. Sur le sceau, aux armes de Looz, on lit: SIGILLUM LUDOVICI COMITIS LOOZ; et sur le contre-sceau, qui représente *un lion rampant contremont*, se trouve l'inscription suivante: SIGILLUM COMITIS DURAS.¹² Le comte de Clermont du roman serait donc celui de Clermont-sur-Meuse, soit Wéri de Walecourt, soit son fils Jacques I^{er}, mort avant 1235.¹³ Parmi les combattants du tournoi de Saint-Trond, Jean Renart mentionne à deux reprises *cil de Walecourt* (vss 2665, 2694), qui est probablement le même personnage que le *gentil comte de Clermont*.

LOUIS-ANDRÉ VIGNERAS

University of Maine

A FORGOTTEN PARTICIPANT IN THE ATTACK ON THE CONVENT: MADAME DE GENLIS

The attack against the convent is an interesting episode in XVIIIth century polemics, especially curious because many devout believers joined with the *philosophes* in the general outcry. Mme de Genlis' part in the discussion has been completely ignored; de Luppé, the only one even to mention her in this connection, classifies her inexactly among the defenders of the convent, a view which indicates superficial acquaintance with her works.¹

Examination of the various arguments reveals that there were five points in the criticism of the conventual system. No less than four of them find typical expression in Mme de Genlis' writings.

La vocation forcée, the abuse, peculiar to the social system of the time, of forcing the youngest daughter to take the veil in order to increase the heritage or *dot* of the elder children, was criticized with vehemence. Atheists and believers were struck with equal force by its cruelty and injustice, by its inhumane suppression of the rights of nature. The story of Cécile, in Mme de Genlis' novel *Adèle et Théodore*,² is a pathetic picture of the evils of this custom. The story tells of the cruelty of Cécile's father:

¹² Edouard de Block, *Armorial des princes du sang royal de Hamaut et de Brabant* (Paris, 1898), 235.

¹³ *Miroir des nobles de Hesbaye*, I, 146.

¹ De Luppé, *Les Jeunes filles à la fin du XVIII^e siècle*, Paris, 1926, p. 45.

² Paris, 1782.

Ce jour même son père inhumain célébrait à Paris les noces de son fils, et se livrait aux transports de joie, tandis que la fille infortunée consommait, à dix-sept ans, son affreux sacrifice. . . . Cependant, déjà son cœur n'était plus libre, elle était aimée. . . . Enfin, c'en est fait, Cécile n'existe plus pour le monde, et les tristes murs qui la renferment sont désormais pour elle les limites de l'univers.³

The story continues with a pathetic picture of Cécile's resultant illness and suffering, the father's remorse in later years, and their reconciliation. Cécile at last expresses resignation to her fate, but

Elle n'a que vingt-sept ans si belle et si jeune encore, avec une âme si passionnée, une imagination si vive, comment espérer qu'elle soit pour jamais à l'abri de toute espèce de regrets? ⁴

Shortly thereafter, indeed, she witnesses the happiness of a poor family and the domestic joys of which she has been deprived, falls ill of grief, and dies after exclaiming:

Dans cet instant un noir sentiment d'amertume et de jalousie a flétri mon âme . . . mais ce tableau ne pouvait que m'éclairer davantage sur l'horreur de mon sort, et m'apprendre à mieux connaître encore toute l'étendue du sacrifice affreux qu'on m'a fait faire Hélas! cette femme est au milieu de ses enfants, entre les bras d'une mère tendre et d'un époux chéri! Et moi, malheureuse . . . il me faut renoncer aux plus doux sentiments de la nature.⁵

Such is Mme de Genlis' denunciation of a vicious practice, condemnable for its cruelty and for its suppression of natural instincts. She might well have concluded with the words of Diderot:

Voilà ce qui arrive tôt ou tard, quand on s'oppose au penchant général de la nature . . . Tuez votre fille plutôt que de l'emprisonner dans un cloître malgré elle, oui, tuez-la.⁶

Another accusation was that of vice and corruption.⁷ There is no doubt that most convents were contaminated by the *esprit du siècle*, and in some cases, even charges of moral and sexual vices were scarcely exaggerated. Plays on this subject were no rarity towards the close of the century.⁸ Indeed, Laujon, after com-

³ *Adèle et Théodore*, ed. 1802, I, 140-141.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 256.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 267.

⁶ *La Religieuse*, 1760, *Oeuvres*, édition Assézat et Tournoux, v, 72

⁷ Cf. Fénelon, *AVIS à une dame de qualité*, 1715, p. 178, *La Religieuse*; La Harpe, *Mélanie*, 1770; Monvel, *Les Victimes cloîtrées*, 1791, etc.

⁸ Cf. Edmond Estève, "Le théâtre 'monacal' sous la Révolution," *RHL.*, 1917.

pleting his comedy, *Le Couvent*, found it necessary, in order to avoid a "spicy" connotation, to add the subtitle, *ou les Fruits du caractère et de l'éducation*; as he says, "pour éloigner de l'esprit des spectateurs toute idée malignement indécente."⁹ Such indeed must have been the prevailing condition in order to arouse the ire of Mme de Genlis, otherwise so staunch in her defence of everything connected with the Church that she earned the title of "mère de l'Eglise." In her criticisms, it should be noted, she deals only with moral vices and does not go so far as to admit sexual aberrations.

The one-act play, *Cécile ou le sacrifice de l'amitié*,¹⁰ is a biting satire of such corruption, a denunciation of conventual intrigues, avarice and hypocrisy. It portrays an abbess attempting, by means of suasion, flattery and *friandises*, to persuade two of her pupils to take the vows, both of them being rich and of distinguished family. The novices are seduced by false sweetness, and the abbess would even like to reduce the noviciate to six months:

Un an fait naître trop de doutes et coûte trop cher en confitures et chocolat, il y aurait plus de religieuses et ce serait moins cher. . . Cela fait ressouvenir du proverbe, Des mouches qu'on prend avec du miel.¹¹

But Cécile's sister comes to withdraw her from the convent and tells her she has inherited a large fortune. She can serve God better, says the sister, by active charity than by seclusion in the cloister. Whereupon the abbess, resigned to losing her pupil, intervenes to hint that indeed, "on peut être bienfaitrice d'un couvent."¹² But the sister tartly responds:

Enrichir celles qui firent vœu de pauvreté n'est pas, je crois, le meilleur usage qu'on puisse faire de sa fortune.

More than ten years later, Mme de Genlis renews the attack,¹³ charging that convents are continually agitated by passions and intrigues.

Après avoir fait, à la face des autels, les vœux d'obéissance, d'humilité, de pauvreté . . . (l'abbesse) vit avec faste dans une représentation continue, en gouvernant despotiquement ses sœurs et ses égales¹⁴

⁹ Laujon, *Le Couvent*, Paris, 1790, "représenté pour la première fois, sur le Théâtre de la Nation, le 16 avril 1790"; *Préface*, iii.

¹⁰ *Théâtre d'Education*, I, 1779.

¹¹ Scène I

¹² Scène V

¹³ *Discours sur la suppression des couvents*. Paris, 1791.

¹⁴ *Ibid*, p. 2.

And a little farther, she affirms that convents

offrent tous les vices qu'on remarque dans les Cours, l'ambition, la flatterie, la vanité, la jalousie, l'envie, etc.¹⁵

A third point raised in the discussion was that cloistral seclusion was no preparation for marriage and the worldly life, full of temptations, that abruptly followed withdrawal from the convent. The viscountess in one of Mme de Genlis' plays, *Les Dangers du monde*, is an illustration of the consequences of secluded education. She is a bored, dissipated and despicable woman; she has the virtue, however, of realizing her faults, and blames them on her education in the convent:

Pour moi, j'ai été mise au couvent dès mon enfance, et je n'en suis sortie que pour me marier. . Je me suis livrée à la mode que j'ai trouvée établie dans le monde, n'ayant nulle ressource en moi-même, j'en ai cherché dans une dissipation qui pouvait seule m'arracher à l'ennui.¹⁶

The same lesson is expressed in Laujon's comedy, one of the *pensionnaires*, who expects to be married shortly, exclaims:

Aime-t-il du moins le Bal, la comédie, les Spectacles enfin? . . Oh! je veux qu'il en raffole, parce que j'en raffolerai, moi, et qu'il faut bien que je me dédommage de l'ennui que j'ai eu au Couvent.¹⁷

After reading these criticisms, one would naturally conclude that Mme de Genlis welcomed the suppression of the convents, decreed by the National Assembly in February 1790. On the contrary, she warmly opposed their destruction, in the previously cited *Discours*, written shortly after the decree. That is where the *dévot*e could no longer find herself in accord with the *philosophes*. The latter, constantly throughout the century, attacked monasticism as contrary to the laws of nature and the interests of society (this constituting the fourth point in the attack).

La nature, en vous accordant les qualités sociales, ne vous destine point à l'inutilité. . . . Je n'aurai point donné la vie à un enfant . . . pour le

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

¹⁶ *Dangers du monde*, v, 3.

¹⁷ Laujon, *op. cit.*, Scène xvi. Cf similar criticisms in numerous treatises on education. "Des femmes qui ont renoncé au monde avant de le connaître sont chargées de donner des principes à celles qui doivent y vivre" (*Encyclopédie*, vi, 1754, p. 472); Fénelon, *op. cit.*, pp. 178-179.

laisser descendre tout vif dans le tombeau; et avec lui mes espérances et celles de la société trompée ¹⁸

Mme de Genlis, as a devout Catholic and defender of the Church against its upstart enemies, the *philosophes*, upheld the sacredness of the convent for those who truly felt the call. She was not opposed to celibacy and monasticism *per se*. It is from this purely religious standpoint that she condemns their suppression in the first pages of the *Discours*, insisting that there are many nuns who are holy, sincere, virtuous, well-educated, and intelligent.

A final complaint, frequently expressed,¹⁹ was that the instruction obtained in the convents was antiquated, entirely inadequate and poorly conducted. The nuns giving instruction, it was charged, were ignorant and incapable. Mme de Genlis' criticisms are again representative. In *Cécile* the heroine is bored and disgusted by the silly talk she hears at table, and confides to her friend that

le désœuvrement et l'ignorance conduisent nécessairement à tout ce que nous voyons ici ²⁰

In the *Discours* she analyses in detail the faults of conventual instruction; ²¹ she insists it is bad in all convents, both in method and in subject matter, though admitting that in a few of them better education is offered than that obtainable in most homes of the time.²²

Mme de Genlis' criticism is not, however, purely destructive, as was that of most opponents of the convents, who had called for their suppression and left society without a satisfactory alternative. Their attacks were entirely theoretical and ignored the practical aspect of the question, for at that time there was no alternative to education in the convent, except a private tutor.

Mme de Genlis, assuming a much more practical attitude, urges that convents be reformed rather than suppressed. Her program, to be found in the pages of the *Discours* (which could more properly be entitled "Discours sur la réforme de l'éducation con-

¹⁸ Diderot, *Père de famille*, 1758, VII, 210. Cf. *Encyclopédie*, art. "Célibat."

¹⁹ De Luppé, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-44, has a good bibliography for two of the arguments discussed in this article.

²⁰ *Cécile*, Scène III.

²¹ P. 5 ff

²² It is apparently on this admission that de Luppé bases his conclusion that Mme de Genlis was one of the defenders of the convent.

But the Revolution did not succeed in permanently destroying monasticism. Condemned in a philosophic but furious wave of reform, convents were gradually revived a scant decade later. At the beginning of the new century, they found both official tolerance, and, in Chateaubriand's *Génie du Christianisme*, poetic vindication.

The romantic apostle of Christianity defends monasticism with his usual poetic eloquence. Celibacy, in Chateaubriand's opinion, is the safeguard of the pastor's intimate contact with his flock, entirely absent in Protestant countries; it assures his interest in them rather than in a family of his own.²⁴ Furthermore, celibacy is not opposed to the welfare of society, since it has not impeded increase of population.²⁵ Finally, Chateaubriand exalts the poetic qualities inherent in celibacy and monastic life.²⁶ He makes no attempt, however, to reply to those who complained of grave moral or educational abuses.

The government, meanwhile, had assumed a less harsh attitude; special toleration was granted certain orders as early as 1800 and in 1802 there were sixty-two convents in Paris. The Concordat, curiously enough, did not touch upon the problem of regular clergy, and convents remained condemned by law. In a decree of 1804, however, the government announced its right to make special exceptions; and in 1810, all monasteries providing instruction were legalized, if they did not require irrevocable vows. As a result of these two decrees, more than twelve hundred monasteries and convents were reestablished during the first Empire. The latter especially were welcomed, since Napoleon, among his various establishments, had made no provision for female education. Convents, then, enjoyed special official favor and complete liberty. Henceforth they rapidly assumed their former importance and domination of female education. Like the phoenix of ancient fable, the convent was born anew, chastened by its figurative, and not infrequently literal, ordeal of fire.

LESTER GILBERT KRAKEUR

University of California

²⁴ Cf. I, ch. VIII.

²⁵ Moreover, Chateaubriand finds in Christ's virginity a warning that humanity has reached a desirable limit of population; over-population is the cause of war and of mutual destruction in a bestial struggle for self-preservation. (Cf. I, 47-8.) Chateaubriand thus disposes of the arguments of the *philosophes*.

²⁶ Cf. I, ch. IX: II, ch. V, VI.

SHAKESPEARE'S "LAY HER A-HOLD"

Contemporaneous evidence to support a variant interpretation of Shakespeare's nautical expression "Lay her a-hold" has been found in an independent search suggested by the editing of the word *lay* for the *Early Modern English Dictionary*. In the familiar storm scene at the opening of *The Tempest* appears the boatswain's expression, "Lay her a-hold," as an order to the sailors at the height of the gale. Shakespearean editors and lexicographers, taking this phrase at its face value, have given a generally uniform and plausible interpretation of it. Malone went to the second Baron Mulgrave (1744-1792), a prominent naval officer, for an explanation of the entire storm passage, but this explanation interpreted the phrase in question in only these terms: "The ship, having been driven near the shore, the mainsail is hawled up, the ship wore." Rolfe, more than a century later, not only pointed out that Captain E. K. Calver, R. N., F. R. S., indorsed Lord Mulgrave's views, but also in his own notes seconded this interpretation by quoting with approval Steevens's earlier comment: "To lay a ship a-hold is to bring her to lie as near to the wind as she can, in order to keep clear of the land, and get her out to sea," a comment which is parallel in meaning to Calver's "Keep her to the wind or as close to the wind as possible."

The *NED*. met the problem in its first volume. There the lone quotation from *The Tempest* appears as the only evidence for the existence of the word A-HOLD, which the editors treated as a bona fide combination of A, *prep.*, and HOLD, and which they defined only in the phraseology of Admiral Smyth's *Sailor's Word-Book* (ante 1865): "A term of early navigation for bringing a ship close to the wind, so as to hold or keep it." In his great *Lexicon* of Shakespeare's English Alexander Schmidt has simply "a nautical term evidently purporting to keep clear of the land"; but the *Supplement* to the *Lexicon* quotes Herford's later emendation: "to bring her close to the land by hauling up the mainsail." Dyce, in his *Glossary*, followed the *NED*. by defining the phrase thus: "to make her hold to the wind, and keep clear of land." Cunliffe's *New Shakespeare Dictionary* offered only the succinct definition: "to bring to the wind." *The Shakespeare Glossary* edited by C. T. Onions has the curt explanation: "close

to the wind." Textual and lexical comments in the various single and collected editions appear to be consistent with this series of definitions.

Some years ago, however, Mr. L. G. Carr Laughton asserted that the nautical order "Lay her a-hold" is "meaningless."¹ In the following words he further attacked the prevailing interpretation.

There was neither then, nor ever, such a term in use. It is in all probability due to a mishearing on Shakespeare's part. To "lay a ship a-hull" is to bring her as nearly as possible to front the wind and sea and to make her lie in that position with no sail set. In a severe storm this was always done, but of course the ship drove to leeward. It soon appears that if she continues to "hull," the ship must go ashore; the only hope lies in carrying a press of sail in order to claw off the lee-shore, so the boatswain orders the "two courses," i. e. the equivalent of reefed main and foresails, to be set.

Unfortunately, though Mr. Laughton did suggest a comparison with the verb *to hull* used by Shakespeare (*Twelfth Night*, I, v, 217; *Richard III*, IV, iv, 439; *Henry VIII*, II, iv, 197), he offered no Elizabethan evidence for the actual existence of the phrase *lay a-hull*. Provocative as his criticism was, it remained only an assertion against the authority of the *NED.* and of Shakespearean scholars.

It now appears, however, that editorial opinion respecting Shakespeare's *lay a-hold* may well be revised in accordance with Mr. Laughton's assertion, for recently examined materials have provided the evidence that the phrase *lay a-hull* was actually in use by Elizabethan mariners, and with a meaning different from the putative signification commonly accorded to it. In 1578, for instance, one Edward Sellman, who accompanied the explorer Martin Frobisher on his third expedition in search of the Northwest passage, wrote an account of the voyage. Here appeared the phrase in question: "We sayled as aforesaid untill 4 a clocke at afternone, and then we layde yt a hull"; and "All the night we layde yt a hull."²

The clearest possible evidence for the meaning of this collocation is found in another instance of its use. In 1609 (probably within a few months of the writing of *The Tempest*) a Robert Juet

¹ L. G. Carr Laughton in *Shakespeare's England* I, 161.

² Edward Sellman in *Frobisher's Three Voyages* (Hakluyt Soc., 1867), p. 295.

"of Limehouse," freshly returned from stirring experiences on the "third Voyage of Master Henrie Hudson toward Nova Zembla," recorded those experiences. At one time during the ocean trip, wrote Juet, "It began to Thunder and Lighten, whereupon we tooke in all our sayles, and layd it a hull, and hulled away North till midnight, a league and a halfe."³

Further evidence, if desired, can be adduced from the nautical phrases *to be a hulling*, *to be a-hull*, and *to lie at hull*, all of which mean the same as *to lay* (a ship) *a-hull*, and all of which have already been recorded from the voyage literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. *NED.* has quotations from 1582 and 1628 for *to be a-hull* (s. v. A-HULL), from 1556 and 1634 for *to lie at hull* (s. v. HULL, sb.²), and from 1558 for *to lie a hulling* (s. v. HULL, vb.). Apparently the connection has not hitherto been traced between this available material and the phrase under discussion. These quotations, furthermore, may be easily supplemented, for additional instances, I have noticed, are not infrequent in sea narratives of the period.

It may also be pointed out that there is valuable negative evidence in the non-appearance of *lay a-hold* aside from the solitary use by Shakespeare. The examination of the vocabulary of Elizabethan voyage literature for the *Early Modern English Dictionary*, though yielding a good store of nautical usages, has failed to reveal among them a single *a-hold*. Surely considerable significance may be attached to the fact, too, that the first real dictionary of sea language, compiled before 1625, gave a full description of the action of "hulling" but recorded for *hold* only the common sense, that of a ship's interior.⁴ *A-hold* does not appear here, nor in the better known *Sea Grammar* of Captain John Smith in 1627.

Finally, the non-appearance of *hold* = hull of a ship prevents, I think, the possible re-representation of the theory that *hold* is a legitimate variant of *hull*, a theory which the *NED.* editors themselves (s. v. HULL, sb.²) dismiss as being phonetically unsound.

Against the acceptance of this argument it may be objected that the situation presented in the storm scene does not admit the

³ Robert Juet, *Third Voyage of Henrie Hudson in Purchase his Pilgrimes* (Hakluyt Soc., 1906), xiii, 355.

⁴ Sir Henry Manwaring: *Seaman's Dictionary*, 1644 (ante 1625), in *Life and Works of Sir Henry Mainwaring* (Naval Records Soc., 1921), Vol. II, s. v. HOLD and HULLING. *A-hull* is used on p. 173.

possibility of an officer's giving the order to brave the tempest with bare poles. But let us examine the situation again. The ship is progressing under sail and not far from land when the storm comes up. The shipmaster, aware of the proximity of shore, advises his first officer, the boatswain, to take necessary steps, and then leaves, apparently having placed the boatswain in charge. (The boatswain, in Elizabethan days, was generally the real navigator of the vessel.) Now, addressing the seamen, who have gathered near him, the boatswain gives his first order—to take in some sail—the natural order to be given when a storm strikes. It is only the top-sail which is to be taken in, for the wind as yet is probably not at its height. Now comes an interruption, the colloquy with the nervous passengers, who are presently persuaded to go below. In the meantime the wind has grown stronger, so the next and logical order is to take down the topmast. This leaves only the mainmast; and with the sail on it, that main-sail or main-course, the boatswain orders the ship laid a try. "Trying," defined Manwaryng, "is to have no more sail forth but the mainsail, the tack aboard, the bowline set up, the sheet close aft, and the helm tied down close aboard."⁵ But in a strong gale even one sail may be dangerous to the safety of the vessel; and this is the situation which now develops. At the same time an interruption, caused by the reappearance of three passengers on deck, temporarily distracts the boatswain's attention. Suddenly, however, he realizes the imminent danger from the increasing force of the wind and orders even this one sail to be taken in, lest the ship heel completely over. That is, he orders "Lay a-hold," which I take to be "Lay a-hull."

That this was the normal step to be taken in a strong gale is indicated further by Manwaryng's definition. Of "Hulling," he declares, "in foul weather, when they are able to bear no sail, the manner is no more but taking in all the sails and tying down the helm to the lee side of the ship."⁶ The fact that the topmast had been lowered did not require an extra order now. Though Manwaryng says, "It is not yet agreed upon amongst all seamen whether it is better to hull with her topmast up or down," yet he admits that, contrary to his own preference, the most received opinion is to have it down, in respect that generally they suppose

⁵ *Op cit.*, p. 250. See also Juet, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 167.

the weight aloft will make her seel the more dangerously in a storm."⁷ In the open sea, then, laying the ship a-hull would have enabled her to ride out the storm as safely as possible. Unfortunately, however, the vessel probably loses more headway than the boatswain had anticipated, and begins to drift toward the nearby lee shore. The certain danger of the rocks is now greater than the risk of heeling over, so the boatswain is constrained to choose the less of two evils. How great he considers the danger is shown by the fact that he is now ready to risk having not one but two sails set in order to give the vessel headway once more, and he commands the helmsman, "Lay her off," that is, steer away from shore. But the sails have been set too late, and the ship crashes.

The fact that the commands "Lay her a-hold" and "Set her two courses" occur in the same line does not, it seems to me, militate against accepting the foregoing interpretation. There is nothing to indicate that a measurable interval could not have elapsed before the second order. Nor are similar time-gaps infrequent in the plays of Shakespeare.

What, then, do we have? *Lay a-hull* is a standard nautical term of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The action which it names is a normal one in the given situation. *Lay a-hold* is not a standard nautical idiom of this period. It is unrecorded in sea literature and not recognized in sailor word-lists. If its meaning is not that of *lay a-hull*, we have nothing but the context to suggest what the precise meaning might be. And that this deduced meaning is really that of *lay a-hull* is clear in Baron Mulgrave's recognizing that the main-sail, the only remaining sail set, is to be "hawled up."

It would seem reasonable, then, to conclude that the positive evidence for *lay a-hull* and the negative evidence against *lay a-hold* not only now justify Mr. Laughton's designating Shakespeare's collocation "a verbal slip," but also indicate just what meaning Shakespeare must have intended when he made that slip.

HAROLD B. ALLEN

University of Michigan

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 168.

A NOTE ON *I TAMBURLANE*, I, ii, 242-43

When, in the second scene of *I Tamburlaine*, the Scythian has won over by brave words Theridamus, the Persian cavalry leader, Tamburlaine says to him, referring to Techelles and Usumcasane, who have welcomed Theridamus:

These are my friends in whom I more rejoice,
Than doth the king of Persia in his crown:
And by the love of Pylades and Orestes,
Whose statues we adore in Scythia,
Thyself and them shall never part from me,
Before I crown you kings in Asia.¹

The source of the reference to Orestes and Pylades has not been satisfactorily explained. Miss Ellis-Fermor, the most recent editor, in her remark "Marlowe may also have in mind a general memory of the part played by Pylades and Orestes in *Iphigenia in Tauris*,"² is seemingly reflecting the statement of C. H. Herford and A. Wagner that Marlowe "enriched his conception of the remote and little known countries, Persia and Scythia, from his classical reading in Herodotus, Euripides, and Xenophon. The *Iphigenia in Tauris* lay near at hand (*cf.* his allusion to Pylades and Orestes)."³ Dyce quotes the editor (Robinson) of the 1826 London edition of Marlowe: "The first edition reads 'statutes,' but, as the Scythians worshipped Pylades and Orestes in temples, we have adopted the reading of the quarto ['statues'] as being most probably the correct one."⁴ Neither Dyce nor later editors inquire into the origin of the information that "the Scythians worshipped Pylades and Orestes in temples."

It is quite possible that Marlowe gained his knowledge from a work which he might well have known, Lucian's *Toxaris*. In that dialogue Mnesippus, a Greek, begins by expressing surprise that

¹ I, ii, 240-45 *Tamburlaine the Great*, ed. U. M. Ellis-Fermor (London, 1930), pp. 89-90.

² *Ibid.*, p. 90 n.

³ "The Sources of Marlowe's '*Tamburlaine*,'" *The Academy*, xxiii (1883), 266.

⁴ *The Works of Christopher Marlowe* (London, 1865), p. 12 n. All the early texts appeared in octavo; the first two have "statutes," the rest "statues."

the Scythians actually sacrifice to Orestes and Pylades, as if they were gods. Toxaris, a Scythian, explains why they give honors to the famous friends:

Si quidem in Argo atque Mycenis ne sepulchrum quidem ullum insigne videre est Orestis ac Pyladis, apud nos vero & templum ostenditur, ambobus illis communiter sacrum (ita ut par erat amicis) & hostiae offeruntur, reliquosque omnis honos. . . . Quod autem potissimum stupentes in illis viris efferimus, illud est, quod nobis visi sunt amici inter sese longe optimi exstitisse, atque aliis exemplo fuisse, quasique legem statuisset, quemadmodum oportet amicos omnem inter se communicare fortunam. Simulque promeruisse, ut a Scythis, qui in amicitiae laude primas tenerent, colerentur. Itaque quaecunque alter cum altero, vel alter pro altero tulit, ea majores nostri descripta in columna aerea resposuerunt in templo Orestis: ac leges statuerunt, ut ea columna prima esset institutio disciplinaeque liberis suis, si meminissent, quae in illa essent adscripta. Itaque pene patris quisque sui nomen citius oblivisceretur, quam res gestas Orestis ac Pyladis ignoraret. Quin & in porticu templi eadem quaecunque in columna notantur, praeorum picturis adumbrata visuntur. . . . Enim vero ut & illud noveris, nihil amicitia melius arbitrantur Scythae, neque est in quo Scythia magis gloriatur, quam in adiutandis amicis, communicandisque rebus acerbis quemadmodum neque probum apud nos majus ullum, quam amicitiae desertorem videri. Has ob res Orestem ac Pyladem veneramur, quod praestantes exstiterint in Scytharum virtutibus, atque in amicitia praecellentes, id quod nos omnium maxime admiramur.⁵

The following is offered as a possible explanation of the dramatist's procedure:

1. Marlowe had once read, probably at King's School, Canterbury, Lucian's *Toxaris*, in Erasmus's Latin translation.⁶

2. When writing a play about a Scythian he recalled, through association of ideas, the impassioned admiration for friendship expressed by a Scythian, in *Toxaris*, and in particular the memorable passage quoted above.

3. The stress, in the dialogue, on the worship of Orestes and Pylades suggested to him the word "adore" (l. 243) and led him to confuse (unless he consulted the text, as he would very likely not do in the haste of composition) the brazen column—perhaps too the paintings—with statues⁷ in a temple as symbols of honor

⁵ *Desiderii Erasmi Opera Omnia* (Leyden, 1703), I, 215-16.

⁶ I am indebted to Professor T. W. Baldwin for the information that Erasmus's translation was the usual text in the school editions of Lucian.

⁷ The appearance of "statutes" in O₁ and O₂ is merely an illustration of the indiscriminate use, traceable to the middle ages, of the two words.

and worship. It is conceivable, however, that he was intentionally inaccurate, to obtain brevity, and vigor of imagery.

Thus Tamburlaine makes a very strong oath, befitting such a Machiavellian as he.

L. J. MILLS

Indiana University

THOMAS DELONEY: TWO NOTES

I

In his edition of *The Works of Thomas Deloney* (Oxford, 1912, p. viii) Mr. F. O. Mann pointed out the following entry in the parish register of St. Giles Cripplegate, London: "*Richard the son of Thomas Deloney. Weaver. bap. Oct' 16th 1586*" He remarks that "the baptismal entry . . . can scarcely apply to any but him [Thomas Deloney]." It will be recalled that Thomas Nashe in 1596 scornfully referred to "*Thomas Deloney, the Balletting Silke-weauer*,"¹ and that John Strype, discussing a libelous ballad on a corn-famine which had given great offense to the lord mayor of London in 1596, remarks: "The Maker of this scurrilous Ballad was one *Delonie*, an idle Fellow, and one noted with the like Spirit, in printing a Book for the *Silk Weavers*."² The difference between "weaver" and "silk-weaver" is not especially important. But in any case it is interesting to observe that Mr. Mann's entry was copied from the *parchment* transcript of the St. Giles register, which was made about 1600. In the original *paper* register the entry (under "Christenings in October 1586") runs thus: "Richard Delonie sonne of Thomas Delonie silk-weaver the. 16." It is worth noticing that the baby Richard quickly went the way of all flesh; for in all probability he is the subject of the

See *NED*, "statutes, III." Miss Ellis-Fermor, seeking for a meaning of "statutes" in the modern sense, suggests "ordinances, codes" (*op cit*, p. 90 n.). There is a possible basis for that interpretation in "quasiq[ue] legem statuisset, quemadmodum oportet amicos omnem inter se communicare fortunam"; but it is somewhat forced, and weak in that it substitutes a hypothesis for a tangible image in the oath.

¹ *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. R. B. McKerrow III, 84.

² John Stow, *Survey of London*, ed. John Strype (London, 1720), II, bk. 5, p. 333.

melancholy entry under "Burials in December 1586": "Richard Delonie sonne of John Delonie silkweaver the. 21." The father's name, "John," it seems reasonable to suppose, is a clerical error for "Thomas."

Classifying him as a silkweaver does, perhaps, have some value in helping to clear up two of the eight items Mr. Mann lists as "Deloney's Lost Work" (p. 495). They are John Strype's "Book for the Silk Weavers" and an "Epistle of *Momus* and *Zoylus*"³ that Nashe called attention to in 1596, both probably referring to a prose "Complaint of the Yeoman Weavers Against the Immigrant Weavers" of June, 1595. It was printed by Miss Frances Consitt in *The London Weavers' Company* (Oxford, 1933, pp. 312-316) from the Weavers' records, with related material preserved there and a letter from the lord mayor to the lord treasurer discussing the affair. The "Complaint" was addressed to the French church in London, and signed by one "William Muggins, Thomas Delonye and others," all being freemen, members of the Company, and natural-born English subjects. It tells of the plight of law-abiding Company members trying to compete with the alien silkweavers, who would not respect established trade practices and prices. The pamphlet was printed by Gabriell Sympson (or Simson) to distribute among the immigrants as well as the aldermen and the lord mayor of London. But Sympson, Muggins, Deloney, and one Willington, were soon arrested along with eleven others, and, unable to furnish bond, all four were thrown into Newgate. Available copies of the "Complaint" were quickly burned, and Deloney and Muggins had to petition the lord chief-justice before they were released.

Miss Consitt does not point out the probable identity of her "Delonye" and the literary figure, and thus does not carry her version of the incident (pp. 145-52) as far as she might have by comparing the "Complaint" with the Wolsey-Henry VIII story in *Jack of Newbury*. For Jack was the hero of an encounter with Henry and the cardinal which is surprisingly similar and supplementary to the account given above.

II

Of Deloney's novels a number of copies earlier than those reprinted by Mr. Mann have turned up since 1912. For example,

³ *Works*, III, 84.

he followed a 1626 edition of *Jack of Newbury*, but the Huntington Library has a copy dated 1619, as well as a later one (1637) which can be added to Mr. Mann's tabulation (p. 506). Again, his text of *Thomas of Reading* is dated 1623, but the Huntington Library has a much earlier edition of 1612, and another of 1636 not included in his list (p. 547). Mr. W. J. Halliday mentions in his modernized version of *The Gentle Craft*, Part I (Oxford, 1928, pp. 2, 7-8), copies of that novel dated 1637 and 1640 which are now at the British Museum; here also, both come before the 1648 book that Mr. Mann reprinted.⁴ The numerous textual and bibliographical problems raised by these early copies I shall discuss at another time. But a word may be said here about a 1660 edition of *The Gentle Craft* not mentioned by Mr. Mann. The title-page of the Harvard copy follows.

THE / HONOUR / OF THE / Gentle Craft, / A Discourse of Mirth and
VVit, to the Renown of / those two Princes, *Crispine* and *Crispianus* and
all / the true Lovers thereof / [rule] / The Last and best Part. / [rule]
/ Being a most Merry and Pleasant History, not altoge- / ther unprofitable,
nor any way hurtful / And for the glory of the gentle Craft; Let all men
say / that a Shoemakers Son is a Prince born / [rule] / By T. D. / [rule]
/ Newly Corrected, with several pieces added for the / benefit of the Reader,
which was never heretofore / published or Printed. / With a new merry
Song in the praise of the Gentle / Craft, and to be sung by them every
morning on the / 25th day of *October* / *Haud curo invidiam.* / London,
Printed by G P for I Andrews at the *White / Lyon* in *Pye-Corner*, 1660.
(Sigs. [A]-H⁴, black letter, 4°.)

The title promises the story of Crispine and Crispianus, who are the heroes of *The Gentle Craft*, Part I, though actually it is not told. Instead the book is a reprint of the 1639 edition of *The Gentle Craft*, Part II (or of some lost edition later than 1639), with condensations and variations too numerous to particularize here.

G. W. KUEHN

Harvard University

⁴ Copies of an edition printed in 1627 were sold during 1858 and 1889, but have never been located since. The former is noted by W. Carew Hazlitt in his *Hand-book to the Popular, Poetical, and Dramatic Literature of Great Britam* (London, 1867), p. 153, for the latter see *Book-Prices Current* (London, 1888-1889), III, 476.

THE RELATION OF DRAYTON'S "NOAH'S FLOOD" TO
THE ORDINARY LEARNING OF THE EARLY
SEVENTEENTH CENTURY¹

Drayton's "Noah's Flood" is the first of three sacred poems published in the *Muses Elizium* of 1630.² It is without question a lesser work by a lesser poet, but it is distinctly interesting to the student of human culture, because the embellishments added by the poet to the Vulgate³ account of the deluge are highly symptomatic. These additions to the Genesis VI and VII account are of two kinds: traditional Genesis comment and encyclopaedic science. To the modern reader of this poem these deviations from the Biblical account seem very erudite, but to the reader of Drayton's age they were probably not only well known details but expected ones. In this paper some analogues of this material will be noted, not for the purpose of indicating ultimate sources, but with the intention of showing that this material was probably what Mr. Wright has so happily called "middle class learning."

Drayton's extensions of the Biblical account are six in number and are concerned with the state of the world before the Flood, the giant race in the age of Noah, the shape of the Ark, the wood of which the Ark was constructed, the time of building, and the size of the Ark.

On the basis of the Vulgate's "coepissent homines multiplicari super terram" Drayton develops an extended account of the extreme fertility of the world before the Flood (lines 23-72) which is little more than an expanded paraphrase of Ovid⁴ justified by

¹ This study was completed while the author was a Fellow of the American Council of Learned Societies; he wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness to the Council

² For the text see *The Works of Michael Drayton* (J. W. Hebel ed., London, 1932), III, 327-354.

³ In line 989 Drayton indicates, as does the King James version, that the ark came to rest on the seventeenth day of the seventh month, which coincides with the "decima septima" of the Vulgate. The other Latin versions read, "mense septimo, vigesimo septimo die mensis"

⁴ *Metamorphoses*, I, 101-112. See Virgil, *Georgics*, II, 10 ff and 60 ff. (the "Ante Jovem nulli subigebant arva coloni" was naturally influential). The commentary on this passage in any Renaissance edition of

hints from the patristic writers.⁵ The question that arises is whether there was a reconciliation between Ovid and Moses that permitted the frivolous poet of the court of Augustus to supply a commentary on Holy Writ. Such a compromise seems to have occurred, and the best example of it in England may be found in Golding's Epistle to his translation of the *Metamorphoses*:

What man is he but would suppose the author of this booke
The first foundation of his woorkes from Moysees wryghtings tooke?
Not only in effect he dooth with Genesis agree,
But also in the order of creation, save that hee. . ." ⁶

This kinship between Moses and the classics was of some standing. Ficino had indicated the relation between the Hebrew thinker and Plato;⁷ and an unnamed author, writing at the end of the 1616 edition of Conti's *Mythologiae*, related the pagan, Christian, and Hebrew paradises to each other.⁸ A further relationship of this type will be indicated in connection with Drayton's commentary on the giants. The complete expansion of this compromise in relation to the legends of the golden age may be observed in the seventh book of *Paradise Lost*.

Drayton's second extension of the source material stems from "gigantes erant super terram" and is expanded to more than thirty lines (lines 74-112). We are informed about the size of the giants, about their arrogant attitude toward God and man, and about their incestuousness. In his gloss to this passage Drayton acknowledges the aid of Josephus and Berosus; however, neither of these writers supply all the details that Drayton uses. What Drayton probably means by the glosses is that he had heard that both Josephus and Berosus had something about the giants. Drayton's material is really a mixture of Biblical commentary and classical myth. The relation between the two in connection with the Genesis passage may be seen in this extract from the commentary of the famous Louvain theologian, Cornelius a Lapide.

Ovid will supply a plethora of material that would be the common property of the grammar school students of this time

⁵ S Ambrose, "De Noe et Arca," Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, xiv, cols 364-365;

S Augustine, "De Genesi contra Manichaeos," *op. cit.*, xxxiv, col 202.

⁶ *Shakespeare's Ovid* (W. H D Rouse ed, London, 1904), pp. 7-8

⁷ D Platonis, *Opera Omnia* (Ficino ed., Lugduni, 1588), pp. 36, 331, 354.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 588.

Burgensis putat gigantes fuisse daemones, humana specie indutos Vale-
sius putat gigantes fuisse filios demonum incuborum Philo putat homines
sceleratissimos vocati gigantes Sed certum est, gigantes fuisse homines
monstruosa statura, robore, latrocinii et tyrannide insignes Gentiles
sumpserunt fabulam gigantum et Titanum, ut post S Ambrosium et Euse-
bium lib 5 de Praepar. Evang c 4 docet Pererius. Credidit enim vetustas,
gigantes fuisse homines excelsissime staturae, et draconum pedibus, ab
irata tellure procreatos in deorum perniciem, ut scilicet bellum diis infer-
rent, Iovemque caeli possessione deicerent sed temere et frustra: nam a
Iove contriti sunt. quod paucis versibus ita perstringit Ovidius:

Affectasse ferunt regnum caeleste gigantes
Altaque congestos struxisse ad sidera montes.⁹

The nexus between the Bible and Ovid is obvious and it may account to some extent for Drayton's charge of incest; however, the tradition that the giants were incestuous was of long standing and seems to have originated according to Cardinal Hugo de Sancto Charo with Methodius.¹⁰ The accepted tradition relates that the giants sprung from the wives of Cain's son who lived incestuously and from the mating of the sons of Seth with the daughters of Cain "contra praeceptum Adae."¹¹

It will be seen then that in two of the major expansions of the Biblical material the sources derive from a combination of classic poet, Christian father, and current theologian. There is no doubt that this material was simply in the air and was the common property of every literate man. Three further instances occupy little space in the poem. The Ark says Drayton was made of Gopher

⁹ *Commentaria in Pentateuchum Mosis* (Antwerp, 1623), p 112 For other material not cited by a Lapide or Drayton but which added to the general tradition that Drayton depended on see M. Victoris, "Commentariorum in Genesim," *Pat. Lat.*, lxi, col. 955; R. Maurus, "Comment. in Genesim," *Pat. Lat.*, cvii, cols 511-512; Angelomus, "Comment in Gen," *Pat. Lat.*, cxv, col 155; Fulgentius, *De Aetatibus Mundi et Hominis* (Helm ed., Lipsiae, 1898), pp. 135-136; J. Calvin, *Commentaries on the First Book of Moses* (J. King, trans, Edinburgh, 1847), pp 244-246; J Drusus, *Ad Loca Difficiliora Pentateuchi* (Frankerae Frisiorum, 1617), p 34; D. Chytraeus, in *Genesim* (Viterbergiae, 1557), pp 203-204, N Conti, *op. cit.*, pp 342-344; see also the gloss to this passage in any edition of the Junius-Tremellius, *Biblia Sacra*.

¹⁰ *Biblia Sacra* (Venice, 1703), p 9.

¹¹ For further information see S. Remegius, "Commentarius in Genesim," *Pat. Lat.*, cxxxi, col 73, and the commentaries of N. de Lyra and P. di Sancti Maria in the *Lyra Biblie* of 1498.

wood, which some think was pine. The Junius-Tremellius *Biblia Sacra* gives an extended note on this point; a Lapide writes "Oleaster vertit, de lignis pini,"¹² and Calvin gives a similar gloss.¹³ In addition to the material of which it was constructed, the Ark was not built like a keeled ship but, as Drayton points out, like a chest. This tradition arises with Augustine in the *De Civitate* and is echoed throughout patristic literature.¹⁴ The *Bible* of Lyra devotes one of its infrequent illustrations to a plan of this chest-like Ark; and Cornelius a Lapide sums up the tradition:

Non in morem navigii, cuius carina arcuatur, et summitas vel patet, vel concameratur sed in morem cistae undique clausae et quadrangulae, quae inferne plana est, sed ita, ut culmen et clivum exiguum assurgat.¹⁵

Finally, Drayton (line 153) relates his last non-textual fact that the Ark was a hundred years building. This tradition seems to have been an old one. The legend was known to the author of the Old English Story of Genesis and Exodus¹⁶ and to the composer of the York "Noah";¹⁷ a Lapide sums up the material and gives most of the pertinent authorities, who seem to agree with Drayton's extension.¹⁸

More interesting than all these expansions of the Bible is Drayton's argument against the atheists who hold that the Ark was not large enough to accommodate the animals. First, he mentions the great warships of his own age; then, he observes that the cubit was probably a measurement of great dimension; finally, he suggests that the number of animals was less since the species were fewer. In this latter connection he mentions the mule as a species unknown to Noah and proposes that there had been a great deal of cross-breeding since the Flood. The warship argument seems to

¹² *Op. cit.*, p. 114.

¹³ *Op. cit.*, p. 256; see also S. Eucherius, "Comment. in Genesim," *Pat. Lat.*, I, col. 926.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, Lib. xv, cap. 27; S. Eucherius, *op. cit.*, col. 927; Angelomus, *op. cit.*, col. 156.

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 114.

¹⁶ R. Morris, ed., *ÆETS*, VII, 1865, p. 17.

¹⁷ L. T. Smith, ed., Oxford, 1885, p. 49; the Chester, "Noah" and the Junius-Tremellius gloss have 120 years. Rabanus Maurus, *op. cit.*, col. 521, agrees with the hundred years tradition.

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 118; see also Calvin, *op. cit.*, p. 259.

be Drayton's own, but the cubit argument was used by Saint Augustine against the doubters of his age.¹⁹ The species argument appears in a *Lapide* who cites reputable naturalists like Montanus, Gesner, and Aldrovandus in support of his argument; he writes, "nec ea quae ex congressu diversarum specierum, uti mulus ex equa et asino, nascuntur."²⁰

It will be seen that all of Drayton's embellishments of the Genesis story can be traced to many sources, but it is highly doubtful if he used a source at all. These matters which seem very erudite to the modern man were probably matters of fact to men of the early seventeenth century. This point may be re-emphasized by an inspection of the scientific data of "Noah's Flood."

Drayton permits Noah to take some ninety animals, birds, and reptiles into the Ark. In the main the animals are listed; occasionally a little lore is added. In every case where the comment is at all extended it is something that everyone seemed to know. The fact that the Panther (lines 297-300) lures victims with his odour appears in Solinus,²¹ Hildebertus,²² Hugo of St. Victor,²³ Albertus Magnus,²⁴ Erasmus,²⁵ Nashe,²⁶ and Greene.²⁷ The same holds true for the iron eating ostrich,²⁸ the parent loving stork,²⁹ the self-sacrificing pelican,³⁰ and every other bird, beast, and reptile mentioned in Drayton.

¹⁹ "Quaestiones in Heptateuchem," *Pat. Lat.*, xxxiv, col. 549; S. Eucherius, *op. cit.*, col. 927, C. a. Lapide, *op. cit.*, p. 116, also the Junius-Tremellius gloss.

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 116.

²¹ *Rerum Memorabilium*. 17. 8.

²² "Physiologus," *Pat. Lat.*, clxxi, col. 1224.

²³ "De Bestiis," *Pat. Lat.*, clxxvi, cols. 69-70.

²⁴ "De Animalibus," *Opera* (Borgnet, ed. Paris, 1896), xii, 424.

²⁵ "Similiae," *Opera* (1706, Lug. Bat.), i, 622.

²⁶ *Works* (McKerrow, ed. London, 1904), i, 21.

²⁷ *Works* (Grosart, London, 1881-1886), ii, 44, 51.

²⁸ Lines 384-386; see Albertus Magnus, *op. cit.*, xii, 502, and Nashe, *op. cit.*, iii, 273.

²⁹ Lines 406-410; see S. Ambrose, "Hexaameron," *Pat. Lat.*, xiv, col. 228; Rabanus Maurus, "De Universo," *Pat. Lat.*, cxi, col. 245; Hugo de S. Victor, *op. cit.*, col. 43; and Albertus Magnus, *op. cit.*, xii, 447.

³⁰ Lines 410-413; see Hugo de S. Victor, *op. cit.*, col. 29; Albertus Magnus, *op. cit.*, p. 499; and Nashe, *op. cit.*, iii, 124.

There is then no source for this extra material that Drayton adds to the Genesis account. There are, to be sure, hundreds of sources, but one can doubt with reasonable safety any hypothesis that Drayton "prepped up" in Genesis commentary and in zoology before writing the poem. One can safely assume that this knowledge was common to most men of this time and that Drayton gave them what they expected.

State College of Washington

DON CAMERON ALLEN

DRYDEN AND ETON

Mr. Roswell G. Ham's interesting article in these pages on *Dryden and the Colleges*, while primarily concerned with Oxford, also deals with the poet's alleged views on Eton.¹ Some lines are there quoted from an anonymous satire of 1689, entitled *The Address of John Dryden, Laureat to His Highness the Prince of Orange*, and followed by this comment: "Hence we have the first hint that Dryden, at some period of his career, was perhaps not without hope of becoming provost of Eton College." I submit that this hint, whether well-grounded or not, was not the first, but that priority may be claimed for the following passage from Elkanah Settle's *Absalom Senior, or Achitophel Transposed* (1682):

Near those bright towers, where Art has wonders done,
And at his feet proud Jordan's waters run,
Where David's sight glads the blest summer's sun,
A cell there stands, by pious founders raised,
Both for its wealth and learned rabbins praised;
To this did an ambitious bard aspire,
To be no less than lord of that blest choir;
Till wisdom deemed so sacred a command
A prize too great for his unhallowed hand.²

The lines that come next give another reason for Dryden's rejection: his love for a certain Laura,³ and bring against him a general charge of "whoring" which it is not necessary to discuss here.

¹ *MLN*, XLIX, 329.

² The whole portrait of Dryden is quoted in the Scott-Samtsbury edition of Dryden, IX, 359-60, without comment (possibly because the editors thought the allusions were transparent Cf *infra*, n. 6).

³ Her identity remains a mystery to me. According to Settle she is both lavish of her favours and particularly intimate with "Ethiop's envoy."

If we remember that in *Absalom Senior* as well as in *Absalom and Achitophel* David stands for Charles II, we cannot but identify the "bright towers" by "Jordan's waters" with Windsor Castle. The "wonders" there "done" by "Art" may be an allusion to the various alterations made by the Merry Monarch in the feudal pile, especially the decorations entrusted to the Italian painter Antonio Verrio.—The "pious founder" of the neighbouring "cell" is then recognizable as Henry VI, and the cell itself as Eton College.

Mr. Ham says we have no "definite clue as to the year of the Eton adventure." But it seems hardly possible that Dryden should have entertained such hopes as are denounced here at any other time than 1680/1, since the preceding vacancy (1665) would take us back too far and the next one was to happen only in 1695. Now Richard Allestree died on the 28th of January and Zachary Cradock succeeded him on the 24th of February 1680/1. Within these four weeks (unless Allestree's death had been looked forward to for some time) Dryden's candidature must have arisen and fallen through, if there be any truth in the report. What might make us sceptical is not so much the absence of any reference to Dryden in the College records⁴ as the way Anthony à Wood tells the story of Allestree's succession.⁵ He says that Cradock carried the provostship against Edmund Waller, the poet, who "had tugg'd hard for it." He does not even mention Dryden as a competitor.

If we nevertheless accept Elkanah Settle's testimony on this point, are we *ipso facto* bound to accept it when he asserts that Dryden at one time intended to take orders and was rejected? The assertion occurs in the lines immediately preceding those quoted above: Dryden, says Settle, always changed his opinions for interest,

Query. the French ambassador? (In *Absalom and Achitophel* Louis XIV is Pharaoh and France is Egypt). Or does Ethiop stand for a more southern country than France, e. g. Spain? The only other passage in *Absalom Senior* where the word Ethiop appears throws no light on its use here, since it is only a variation on a well-known proverb, applied to those who deny the existence of a popish plot. "Yes, they're resolved, in all their Foes' despight,—To wash their more than Ethiop treason white" If Ethiop is Louis XIV, there may be a quibble here.

⁴ For this piece of information as well as for helpful comment on the whole affair I am indebted to the present provost of Eton, Dr. M R James. I have also to acknowledge assistance received from my friend H. M. Margoliouth, the Oxford editor of *Marvell's Poems and Letters*.

⁵ *Athenae*, ed Bliss, III, 1272. Cf. *Aubrey's Brief Lives*, ed. Clark, II, 278

Nay, would have been his own loathed thing, called priest;
 Priest, which with so much gall he does describe,
 'Cause once unworthy thought of Levi's tribe
 Near those bright towers. . .

Mere contiguity would not carry conviction. But the phrase "unhallowed hands," used by Settle to account for Dryden's failure to obtain the provostship, shows that there was a connexion between the two charges: "unhallowed" must mean here "unordained,"⁶ though it may also mean "polluted", probably the two senses are blended in a concert. Besides, we read in Johnson's *Lives of the Poets* that Waller

asked from the King (in 1665) the provostship of Eton College, and obtained it, but Clarendon refused to put the seal to the grant, alleging that it could be held only by a clergyman . . . A year after the Chancellor's banishment, another vacancy gave him [Waller] encouragement for another petition, which the King referred to the council, who . . . determined that the office could be held only by a clergyman, according to the act of uniformity . . . The King then said, he could not break the law which he had made; and Dr. Zachary Cradock . . . was chosen by the Fellows.⁷

This version contains at least one grave inaccuracy, since the act of parliament banishing Clarendon received the royal assent on the 16th of December 1667, while Richard Allestree (as we have seen) retained the provostship from 1665 to his death in 1680/1. Shall we conjecture that Waller hoped to have him ejected at the end of 1667 when the parliamentary opposition to the fallen chancellor shared the spoils, and his friends and *protégés* lived anxious days? Or did Waller, though already past sixty, merely try to secure the reversion of the provostship when Allestree should please to die? Or did his second attempt (the only one known to Wood) take place in 1680/1?

Anyhow, the story shows that, while laymen were not clearly excluded from the start, a candidate at least improved his chances very greatly by taking orders. If Dryden was reported to cherish hopes of the provostship, gossip would naturally infer that he intended to "take to the church," the words he used when, in the

⁶ This is Scott's view, *op. cit.*, I, 358. He there quotes the two satires on which Mr. Ham rests his case and adds: "The same reproach is urged by Settle. See vol. IX," meaning, however, no more, as it seems, than the reproach of abusing the clergy out of spite for being refused orders.

⁷ "Waller" in *Lives*, ed. Hill, I, 273-4.

last year of his life, he protested that such a step "was never in *his* thoughts."⁸ I see no reason for suspecting Dryden's sincerity on a point of fact, especially when he felt so near the final call of his Maker, and therefore admit that, if he did "tug for the provostship," he, like Waller, expected to obtain it as a layman.

We might go one step further, knowing as gossip spreads and improves on its way:

Fame, the great ill, from small beginnings grows—
Swift from the first, and every moment brings
New vigour to her flights, new pinions to her wings. . . .
She . . .

Things done relates, not done she feigns, and mingles truth with lies

Settle (note his words) may have heard that "an ambitious bard" was "aspiring" at the beginning of 1681 (N. S.) to succeed Richard Allestree; and about a year after he may have used this trait in his portrait of Dryden. If so, the later satirist quoted by Mr. Ham did no more than take up Settle's convenient allegation.

On the other hand there is nothing intrinsically improbable in the ambition ascribed to Dryden. And, even if the feelings of the fellows towards the poet laureate were doubtful, that mattered little; for, contrary to Wood's (and Johnson's) statement that Cradock became provost "by virtue of the election thereunto of the fellows," Maxwell Lyte⁹ maintains that the appointment was made by royal

⁸ Preface to the *Fables, ad finem*. Gossip would make the inference all the more readily since in the anonymous *Trial of the Poets for the Bays* (latter half of 1677) Apollo had already given Dryden "leave now his poetry's done, To let him turn priest since Reeve is turn'd nun" This, however, looks like a mere stroke of (Rochester's?) wit, which became sober fact to the duller minds of Settle and Shadwell (v *The Tory Poets*, 1682).

The rumour about Dryden and holy orders has been traced up to an obscure libel dated 1668 (which, it seems, is neither in the Bodleian nor in the printed catalogue of the British Museum) by Mr. Hugh Macdonald, whose comprehensive and erudite examination of the "Attacks on Dryden" will be found in vol. XXI of *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*. It came out in July 1936 when the present note was already in type, and goes to prove that Settle was not starting but merely reviving a piece of scandal. *Absalom Senior* is briefly mentioned by Mr. Macdonald (p. 58) with the remark "It contains a curious passage in which it is said that Dryden had aspired to become Provost of Eton"

⁹ *History of Eton College* (new issue of 1877), pp. 274-5.

mandate, a procedure never departed from since the Restoration. Now, that the King's favour did not desert Dryden in those years, Professor Bredvold himself has shown.¹⁰ The author of the *Spanish Fryar* was not a mal-content. And the Epilogue "Spoke before His Majesty at Oxford, March 19. 1680" (*i. e.* 1680/1), which Mr. Ham has discovered,¹¹ proves Dryden to have supported Charles II's policy less than a month after his disappointment (if he was disappointed) and acted like a "firm, consistent, and loyal tory."

But though Dryden took sides I am not going to imitate him. I now stand by to see Professor Bredvold and Mr. Ham fight it out with the fresh weapons I have provided for them.

PIERRE LEGOUIS

University of Lyons

DRYDEN AND ALL SOULS

In *MLN.*, April, 1931, Professor Bredvold mentioned a rumour current in 1687 that Dryden's name was connected with the wardenship of All Souls. To prove that this was more than a rumour Mr. R. G. Ham (*MLN.*, May, 1934) cited a letter of Finch, the successful candidate, in which he speaks of 'Mr. Dryden' as one who 'so lately stood so faire to preside over them.' As this is the strongest evidence that Mr. Ham brings forward it seems worth while to draw attention to the following letter, hitherto unnoticed, dated 'Oxon. Jan. 19, 1686,' and written by Arthur Charlett (then a Fellow of All Souls), probably to George Hickes, Dean of Worcester:

Hond Sr

You shall not complain always of unwelcom news from me, having now an opportunity to acquaint you with some agreeable & very pleasing to all the Honest men of this place; Yesterday returned hither Mr Leopold Finch with a mandate to succeed Dr. James. . . . The Contest lay between Mr. Dryden & him, which the King decided in his Favor upon Munday last Having formerly writ a Preface to Cornelius Nepos, His Majesty, then D. of York took notice of him for some Passages that gave offence elsewhere, & assured him of his Favor several Times since. . . . [Bodleian MS. Eng hist c 6 f 122.

¹⁰ *Essays and Studies in English and Comparative Literature*, University of Michigan, 1932, pp. 123-7.

¹¹ *London Mercury*, March, 1930, pp. 422-3.

This explicit statement by one who had every reason to be interested in the election must be considered important confirmation of Finch's remark, and makes it clear that Dryden's candidature was more than a rumour.

J. A. W. BENNETT

*Merton College,
Oxford*

THE MATCHLESS ORINDA

In his biography of Katharine Philips Mr. Philip Souers tells us that "In his [Dryden's] eyes, and in the eyes of the generation after him, it would seem that Orinda was still the incomparable Orinda, still the paragon of women writers."¹ We learn further that Cowley's portrait of her as "the woman laureate . . . whom Apollo would choose in the face of Sappho and the famous nine" was "the portrait that lived for more than fifty years . . . becoming even more ideal as Mrs. Behn and her fellows corrupted the position in literature that Orinda had made for women."²

Apparently this view was not held quite so widely as Mr. Souers says, for a mention of Orinda and the Chaste Aphra that seems to have escaped notice, in the Rev. Thomas Newcomb's curious poem "Bibliotheca: A poem occasioned by the sight of a modern library," published in 1712, gives ground for a somewhat different belief.

Orinda next demands his view,
For titles fam'd, and rhyming too;
And had been read, but that her song,
To be admir'd, was quite too long.
Their mistress' want of pride to shew,
Her numbers glide but wondrous low,
Instead of rapture give us sleep,
And, striving to be humble, creep.
Philipps in verse her passion told,
Intreats the youth to be less cold;
Begs him, while nature charms demes,
To mind her wit, and not her eyes;
Instructs the novice how to wooe,
And shews what little art will do,

¹ Philip Webster Souers, *The Matchless Orinda*, Cambridge, 1931, p. 3.

² *Ibid.* 248.

A virgin's yielding heart to move,
And melt a breast inclin'd to love!
Softness her want of sense supplies,
She faints in every line, and dies; . . .
Immortal Behn at last he spy'd,
"Hail, beauteous nymph! the lover cry'd,
See at your feet I prostrate bow,
Neglecting every fair, for you,
Their worthless labours tumbling o'er
In haste, your beauties to adore,
With your bright features, or your quill,
Arm'd with a double power to kill!"^a

R. K. ALSPACH

University of Pennsylvania

NEW LETTERS FROM JAMES FENIMORE COOPER

I am indebted to the Manuscripts Section of the New York State Library for permission to publish the following letter from Cooper to his American publishers, Messrs Carey and Lea of Philadelphia.

Paris, Nov. 6th 1831

Gentlemen,

I hasten to inform you that I shall put to press in a few days, a new tale to be called "*The Heidenmaeur*," pronounced, as any German will tell you, Hy-den-mou-er. The scene is on the Rhine, in the ancient principality of Leiningen once in the present kingdom of Bavaria. The localities struck my fancy, in a recent journey, and I have given expression to what I saw and felt, as usual, in 3. vol duodecim. Should we escape cholera until then, I shall publish in March, beyond a doubt

I do not know how you will like Bravo in America. Nor can I tell you any thing of its reception here, though it is published a few days. But it must be an extraordinary book indeed that excites interest in Europe, just now. I fear we shall never have any thing more from poor Scott. He has had a paralytic stroke, and has gone to the Mediterranean, I apprehend, seriously ill. His mind is said to be unimpaired, but the body is giving way fearfully.

My own health, God be praised! has not been so good in seven years, as it is now. The stomach has come round again, and I escape those nervous attacks that used to lay me up formerly, for a week. They occur now, in bad weather, and are severe, but I am quit for two or three in a year.

^a John Nichols, *A Select Collection of Poems*, London, 1780, III, 44-6.

Any one who understands German will tell you that Heidenmaeur means Pagan's Camp in the vernacular¹—You are the only one who knows of the title, and if you have any professional pride in being the first to announce the labor of your hacks act accordingly. As soon as we begin to print the title must of course leak out

Do not publish any extract from my letters. God protect me from the quackery of drawing attention to myself in that manner. The day will come when we shall all be known for what we are, and impatience on such subjects forms no part of my temperament. Let them puff, and vituperate, who feel the want of such means.

Yours truly

J. Fenimore Cooper

Messrs Carey & Lea

Give your notes as usual to Mr Wilkes.

(turn over)

I saw, in Stone's² paper, a few months since, an article on myself. With much nonsense. There was this expression—"Booksellers quarrel for *his* (meaning me) custom." Now what does this mean. What booksellers have quarrelled about me, let me ask? What booksellers have a right to quarrel about me? Since the death of poor Wiley, whom I loved, credulous and weak as he was in some respects, though at bottom an excellent fellow, and of great good sense—nay, even of talent—but since his death I have had nothing to do with any booksellers but yourselves, in America, and unless you Henry Carey and Master Lea have come to blows, who the devil has dared to say aught in the matter. May the spirit of Elam Bliss pass into the man of the trade who dares to quarrel about me, and I can wish him no greater calamity. If any unbrotherly contention has beset your souls let me refer you to a polyglott which Mr. Matthew Carey as Father of the American Trade will indicate to you, and which contains a wholesome moral corrective in the following words,

Let dogs delight to bark and bite etc etc etc

Read these pungent verses and repent. But I do not anticipate so mortal a duel. Has any thing occurred in England? I never hear any thing of this sort that passes in England, for an English Magazine is a much greater creature in America, than it is, even in its own parish. Even the Quarterly is of no moment at Paris. If you can give me any clue to this Homeric battle, for pity's sake, do. I will at least, see fair play.

¹ In the introduction to *the Heidenmauer* Cooper tells of his visit to the ruins near Dürkheim. He asks his host for a guide. "But one who can speak French is desirable—for my German is far from being classical." The spelling and translation of "Heidenmauer" in this letter prove that statement, although both were corrected before the book was finally printed.

² Probably William R. Stone, editor of the *New York Commercial Advertiser*. Cooper sued him in 1840 for publishing reviews of the *Naval History* which were filled with libelous matter. The court's decision was an absolute victory for Cooper. See H. W. Boynton, *James Fenimore Cooper*, pp. 307-314.

Did you publish Paulding's book? ³ I have just read it, and I think it quite good—some parts excellent, but very unequal. It does not take very well here, for it hits John too hard (not for the truth) but for that gentleman's taste. It is the only American novel I have read since I left home, and I must say I think the species improves—Sir William Johnson, however, is a downright failure—no more like, than Gen. Jackson is like your Father in God The Pope

I knew a good deal of Sir William Johnson by report. Old Hendrick Frey, one of his intimate friends and his executor, was my father's intimate friend, too. From him I have heard an infinity of anecdotes of Sir William, who was a very different sort of person from what Paulding has him. My wife's family too, is connected with the Johnsons. Sir William came to America with his uncle Sir Peter Warren,⁴ who was Mrs Cooper's great uncle, and from the late Miss De Lancey, Mrs Cooper's aunt, I knew a good deal of him. Sir John Johnson married a cousin, too; so, you see, I have been in the way of getting at the truth, and I tell you, sub rosa, that Mr. Paulding has not. But the book has capital things in it. Sir William Johnson was never married at all,⁵ much less to a squaw. Sir John was the son of a white woman—He was knighted during the life of his father, who took care to have his Baronetcy entailed on him by especial limitation, as he never could have inherited. There were children by a squaw. Guy Johnson was one.⁶ But it is of no great importance. Sir William was a man of some talent, and there's an end of it.—Adieu.

Cooper's last work was to be a history of New York. The greater part of the manuscript was destroyed by a fire and what remained was published several years after his death in *The Spirit of the Fair*.⁷ A letter which tells about the work is here reproduced through the courtesy of the Hartwick College Library. There is no indication as to the person to whom it was addressed. Parts of it are difficult to decipher, and the word "Towns" could easily be read as "Tombs" or "Towers."

Hall, Cooperstown, March 31st 1849

Dear Sir,

I have forgotten to desire Mr Fagen [?] to send me a title page of *Spy*

³ James K. Paulding's *The Dutchman's Fireside*, which was published in two volumes by J. & J. Harper in April, 1831.

⁴ Sir William was brought over later, see Arthur Pound, *Johnson of the Mohawks*, New York, 1930, pp. 21-22.

⁵ Historians disagree on this question, see A. C. Buell, *Sir William Johnson*, New York, 1903. For best interpretation see A. Pound, *op. cit.*

⁶ Guy Johnson was Sir William's nephew and son-in-law, see A. Pound, *op. cit.* 325, 430.

⁷ First published in book form as *New York* (ed. D. R. Fox) in 1930.

to deposit for Copy Right. Will you take care and have one sent me that I may send it to Auburn previously to publication?

Have you tried the trade with this edition? The "Towns of Manhattan" gets on well, and to my own satisfaction I am already in medias res, and shall try to fight my way through. I have not quite decided on "Towns" as it is so much like The Heart of Mid Lothian, and may substitute "Men," or "Minds." Perhaps the last would be the best title "The Minds of Manhattan." Let me know what you think of it "The Ways of Manhattan" might do. "Manners" would mislead, and the word is too long.

Yours very truly

J. Fenimore Cooper

KARL J. R. ARNDT

Louisiana State University

THE WORD *ANACHRONISM*

It seems probable that the word *anachronism* from the Greek ἀναχρονισμός, meaning "an error in respect to dates; an error which implies the misplacing of persons or events in time" (Cent. Dict.), acquired its modern currency in consequence of the publication of Joseph Justus Scaliger's great work *De Emendatione Temporum*. Now, although the classic Greek has not expressed the idea of anachronism in verb or noun, the new edition of Liddell and Scott's Dictionary cites three scholia, according to which the passive verb ἀναχρονίζομαι means "to be an anachronism," and one scholion in which the noun ἀναχρονισμός has the modern sense. But the dictionary also cites an Egyptian papyrus in which the active verb with a participle means "to be late in doing," and Eustathius of the XII century who uses the noun in the sense of "exchange of the quantity of two syllables." Hence we see that even in these late Greek examples a single chronological sense had not been established. On the other hand Scaliger's *De Emendatione Temporum* was an epoch-making work. The first edition appeared in 1583, a year after Pope Gregory XIII had approved the calendar, which had been revised by the mathematician Lilius. It was an auspicious time for the "father of chronology" to bring before the world of scholars a work on chronology of stupendous learning, in which numerous errors in ancient history were cor-

rected. The second revised and enlarged edition appeared in 1598, and the *Thesaurus Temporum* in 1606, three years before the author's death. Again in 1629 another edition of the *De Emendatione Temporum* appeared, which claims to have been revised and enlarged with the aid of Scaliger's manuscripts. From this last mentioned edition the following passages have been taken, in which Scaliger uses the word *anachronism*:

Prolegomena XVIII Sed ἀναχρονισμοί illorum Annalium propagati sunt, partim ex erroribus aliorum Chronologorum, quos auctor sequitur, partim ex annis Christi male ad suam veram epocham reductis.

Proleg XXI: pauca de Eusebii erroribus in antecessum delibavimus, in quibus praeter frequentes ἀναχρονισμούς, puerile illud deliramentum de Essenis confutavimus

Proleg. XXIV: Denique iniuste ubique Josephum reprehendit (Eusebius), omnium scriptorum veracissimum et religiosissimum, quod quidem ipsius scripta loquuntur, quem auctorem si non tam contempsisset, nunquam eos ἀναχρονισμούς commisisset.

On page 9 of his *Notae* Scaliger says, in a comment on a fragment of Berossus, the Babylonian priest of Belus: that out of a disregard of the value of native sources: "nati sunt illi portentosi ἀναχρονισμοί in illorum chronicis."

The great stir aroused by these publications is described by J. Bernays in his book *Joseph Justus Scaliger*, Berlin 1855. The most hostile and persistent of his critics were the Jesuits; but they and other critics could only delay the gradual acceptance of his work. Bernays (p. 63) says: "und nirgends sind seine chronologisch-historischen Hauptwerke so früh und so dauernd wie in Grossbritannien zu einem Gegenstand bestreitender Forschung geworden." Hence it is interesting to note that the earliest dated occurrence of the word *anachronism* in Murray's English Dictionary is 1646, which is followed by the dates 1669, and 1704.

In view of the facts presented it seems highly probable that the modern currency of the word *anachronism* is due to Joseph Justus Scaliger.

HERMAN L. EBELING

Goucher College

REVIEWS

Three Centuries of French Poetic Theory, A critical history of the chief Arts of Poetry in France (1328-1630), Chronological Lists of Treatises, Genres of Verses with Anthologies. By WARNER FORREST PATTERSON. University of Michigan Publications Language and Literature. Volumes xiv and xv, 1936. Vol. I, xvii + 978 pp. \$5.00. Vol. II, 523 pp. \$3.50.

C'est une belle contribution à l'histoire littéraire. Sûre et généreuse—généreuse à l'extrême car M. Patterson a laissé son chantier dans son œuvre. Mais le chantier est en ordre et les matériaux organisés. L'idée organisatrice est *la continuité de la tradition poétique française*. Par elle M. P. a pu unifier des données jusqu'alors dispersées dans les travaux d'érudits comme le très regretté Ch. S. Baldwin, Edmond Faral, Ernest Langlois, Emile Kastner, Henry Guy, Henri Chamard, etc. et ceux des maîtres particuliers de M. P., comme H. P. Thieme et J. Gerig. Cette intégration, opérée sur des textes présentés en une mosaïque commode, est un très grand service rendu.

En présence d'un travail aussi vaste et aussi fouillé, et portant sur trois siècles au moins, le plus coûteux effort du "reviewer" est un effort d'abstention. Il ne peut ni passer de gaieté de cœur tant de faits et d'aperçus significatifs ni songer à les relever. Car ce relevé, s'il est incomplet, perd son sens et, complet, il serait impossible. Tout ce qu'il pourra faire c'est de signaler les jalons principaux, les étapes dans cette marche de *l'Art de seconde rhétorique* à *l'Art poétique*, c'est-à-dire des recettes de Versification aux lois de poésie, de la Pratique à l'Esthétique.

Pour la seconde rhétorique latine, le point de départ est le *De re metrica* de Bede, aux alentours de 725. Beaucoup plus spacieux, traitant aussi de pleine rhétorique, le *Laborintus* (circa 1213) d'Evrard l'Allemand et, cinquante ans plus tard, le *De Poetria* de Jean de Garlande, inspirés de Cicéron, d'Horace et du pseudo-Cicéron dit Cornificius, resteront (jusqu'à Pierre Fabri inclusive-ment) le type des arts médiévaux de rhétorique.¹ M. P. souligne aussi à bon droit l'importance des traités provençaux de R. V. de Besalu à Guilhem de Molinier, bien que le problème des rapports vrais de filiation et d'influence demeure toujours en suspens. (Cf.

¹ Bien que M. P. n'ait voulu et n'ait dû faire qu'en esquisse cette partie préliminaire de son étude, il aurait pu marquer davantage l'intérêt des écoles de Chartres, Fleury, Blois, Orléans dès le XII^e siècle et de la *Comédie latine* médiévale qui est application quasi pure de la rhétorique du temps. Cf. Gustave Cohen, *La "comédie" latine en France*, 1931

la note 30, p. 52).² Pour les traités français de *seconde rhétorique*, l'*Art de dactier* (1392) de Deschamps marque, après le *Prologue* et les réalisations poético-musicales de Machaut, une étape importante, bien que, par exemple, Deschamps, avec son idée de la Poésie-Musique, se rencontre avec Garlande.

Au XV^e siècle, l'*Art de rhétorique vulgaire*, attribuable à Molinet, est, dit M. P., la clef de voûte de la poésie française jusqu'à la Renaissance. Un "credo esthétique" y est exprimé, ce "credo" si difficile à trouver au moyen âge. Inexistant? Informulé? Jean Le Maire de Belges, lui, est si avancé qu'il en est quasi isolé. Depuis vingt-cinq ans environ, la critique exalte à bon droit ce curieux et fécond esprit mais le bonhomme et sa vie restent encore pleins d'ombre.³

Pour les *Arts poétiques* et en relation avec la Pléiade, le précurseur est Jacques Peletier, bien que le premier en date des arts poétiques français (relativement) complets soit de Thomas Sebilllet. Peletier est un ami de la Brigade et on peut l'appeler son modérateur. Mais, parmi les adversaires, Barthélemy Aneau (dont J. L. Gerig a éclairé la curieuse physionomie) est un des plus intéressants. Il manifeste un intelligent relativisme en observant que les Vieux que la *Deffence* traite si cavalièrement écrivaient fort bien la langue de leur temps, "propre et entière, non pérégrine, et pour lors de bon aloi et de bonne mise" (p. 371). Quant à la fameuse *Deffence*, M. P. rappelle que son objectif vrai était de sonner pour la poésie une note plus profonde. A Ronsard, réalisateur ferme, théoricien flou, M. P. consacre une étude serrée (pp. 487-613) et qui, même après Paul Laumonier, Henri Franchet et Marcel Raymond, a de quoi intéresser et instruire. Il met en relief ce qu'il y eut chez Ronsard d'opportunisme graduel, d'application à mesurer les forces de son génie et de celui de sa nation. Aux approches du pré-classicisme malherbien, Guillaume des Autels, à la fin de 16^e siècle, annonce la doctrine "oratorical and antipoetic," comme dit fort justement M. P., impliquée dans le *Commentaire de Desportes*. Mais, quatre ans après cette fameuse boutade de Malherbe, un éclectique original, Pierre de Deimier, fort peu lu mais qui mériterait de l'être, offre, suivant la remarque de Thème, une véritable Esthétique du Vers.

Le tableau composite et la synthèse des éléments significatifs de l'*Art poétique* (pp. 832-978), est un des plus vigoureux efforts du robuste travail de M. P. Il y montre cet accroissement en Espace et en Profondeur qui distingue ces Arts de ceux de seconde rhétorique. C'est que, vers 1544, en France, l'influx italo-grec de l'Esthétique platonicienne est venu. Cette irruption a profondé-

² Pour la question des influences sarrazines sur les formes provençales "savantes," on ajoutera le nom d'Aloys Nikl à ceux des chercheurs comme Christopher Dawson et H. A. R. Gibb que rappelle M. P.

³ Miss K. Munn, dans un travail encore inédit, apporte des précisions nouvelles sur la bibliographie et la chronologie de Jean Le Maire.

ment creusé le lit des courants poétiques, surtout de la Pléiade. Mais, si important que soit ce mouvement, M. P. me semble en avoir exagéré la valeur *génétique*, causale. Sans doute, il insiste lui-même sur les compromis erasmiens ménagés entre cet hellénisme et la tradition nationale. Mais, tout de même, il a surfait l'hellénisme *vécu* de la Pléiade. En fait, l'absorption *organique* a été plus lente. On a affiché l'hellénisme plus qu'on ne l'a assimilé. Racine sera plus grec que Ronsard—et Chénier plus que Racine.

Prenons le plus concret, le plus vivant des éléments de cette esthétique renouvelée des Grecs, à savoir l'idée du Poète comme Inspiré du souffle divin, comme en proie à "la fureur sacrée," comme Voyant et Devin, enfin l'idée du *Vates*. Nous verrons que le pur livresque, le pur emprunt à l'antique, ne suffit pas à expliquer la fortune que cette idée a eue avec la Pléiade. D'abord elle n'est pas purement hellénique. elle est dans la Bible et elle est, avec des types comme Merlin, dans le folk lore. Ensuite, et surtout, cette idée, cette image de l'homme de poésie comme participant et donneur d'Eternité s'est trouvée prendre avec le développement de la Vie de Cour une valeur curiale, *sociale* toute particulière. Si la Pléiade s'en est emparée ce n'est pas seulement parce qu'il y avait eu Pindare et Platon. C'est parce qu'il y avait des Valois, une royale clientèle auprès de qui l'homme de poésie devait vouloir se donner une autorité, une dignité quasi religieuses.

Ce portrait composite du Poète nouveau, du *Vates* Renaissance contre le "facteur" médiéval, M. P., au cours de ses fortes pages, nous en fournit bien les éléments mais il ne les a pas assez ramassés et centrés. Comme en témoignent sa lecture et sa bibliographie remarquables (cf. *List B* du tome II) il sait parfaitement tout le prix de l'historique et du social mais il n'a pas fait assez jouer ces forces actives. Le souci du *social* eût remplacé avantageusement celui de confronter les théories poétiques avec "the appropriate background in the history of general aesthetics." Il est vrai que M. P. a rempli avec discrétion cette partie un peu abstraite et problématique de son programme. Il l'a fait surtout sous forme d'épigraphes toujours intéressantes, et parfois topiques, prises d'esthéticiens comme J. E. Spingarn, De Witt H. Parker, J. L. Lowes, G. Santayana.

Puisse l'étoile de ces noms et de ceux comme J. L. Gerig, H. P. Thieme, H. F. Muller, et d'autres encore que relève la gratitude attentive de M. P., conduire ce bon livre vers un bon destin! Car ce livre mérite d'enrichir le rayon Histoire et Critique de toute sérieuse bibliothèque de travail.⁴

LOUIS CONS

Columbia University

⁴ Je ne puis que signaler brièvement le second volume (*Chronological List et Genres of Verses*). La partie Anthologie est une très utile chrestomathie des réalisations poétiques, ordonnées par genres, depuis le début du 14^e siècle jusqu'au début du 17^e. C'est un fructueux "jardin de plaisance et fleurs de rhétorique" qui, sous cette forme rationnelle et pratique, nous manquait.

The Early English Carols. Edited by RICHARD LEIGHTON GREENE of the University of Rochester. Oxford at the Clarendon Press [N. Y.: Oxford Press] 1936. Pp. cxlviii + 462. \$10.00.

In this collection of carols Dr. Greene prints the text of 474 separate pieces and also 55 versions showing material variants. Of these pieces, no less than 119—one fourth of the total number—are taken from Camb. Univ. Ee. 1. 12, a MS by the Franciscan, James Ryman, dated 1492. Next in point of number are Balliol Coll. MS 354 with 62, Bodleian MS Eng. poet. e. 1 (ed. Thomas Wright, Percy Soc. xxiii) with 52, and Sloane 2593 (ed. T. Thomas Warton Club) with 51. Nine MSS of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and Kele's print of 1550 supply 407 of the texts in this collection, which includes 23 pieces not previously published. It seems improbable that further search will result in appreciably swelling this number. Indeed, Dr. Greene's collection is more likely to be criticised on the ground of its inclusions than of its omissions.

Dr. Greene bases his definition of the carol upon the thesis "that for a late medieval writer or singer the carol was distinguished from other lyrics by its form rather than by its subject" (p. xx). Accordingly, he ignores criteria based upon (1) the occasion of its use—whether for church festival or for tavern,—(2) the circumstances—whether accompanied by dancing or not, (3) the subject matter—whether godly or ribald, (4) the tone—whether popular or learned. Neither by its substance nor its spirit is the carol to be recognized but only by its form. And with respect to its form he sets up two essential tests: "All are in stanzas, the form of which is not changed in the course of the poem, and all have prefixed a group of lines which forms a *burden* or chorus, to be sung (or considered as sung by a reader) before the first stanza and repeated after that and all succeeding stanzas" (p. xxii).

Proceeding uncompromisingly on this definition, Dr. Greene admits such diverse material as No. 95, a theological argument in seven 9-line stanzas beginning "God against nature thre wonders haith wrought," No. 458, "Kytt hathe lost hur key" and No. 460, "My ladyes water-myll." Audelay's narrative of St. Winifred's martyrdom (No. 314, thirty stanzas) is included, presumably because Audelay himself in the concluding stanza refers to the poem as "this carol." On the other hand, No. 412, which Audelay entitles "Cantaleña de puericia," is also included.

Dr. Greene's decision turns upon the question whether or not a burden is written at the head of a given piece. Thus he includes the well-known song of Jankyn (No. 457), but not "The fals fox," written in the same measure with the refrain, "With how, fox, how, with hey, fox, hey" (*Rel. Antiq.* i, 4), although the latter occurs in the Ryman MS from which he takes 119 of his pieces.

Whatever our opinion of the dictum that the burden is an essential characteristic of the carol, one may observe that eight of the carols in his collection (Nos. 79, 123, 125, 146, 157, 191, 322, and 468) appear without burdens except in a single version, and in nearly every case it is the older and better versions which lack the burden. As Dr. Greene himself recognizes, "it is fairly easy to make a carol of a song without a choral element by adding a burden to it. Neither is there any difficulty in substituting for one burden another of a rhythmic form which accommodates itself to the melody of a given piece" (p. cxxxiv). The burden, in other words, cannot be said to supply the impulse for the carol but often is a superficial addition. In the case of No. 191, "Of on that is so fayr and bright," nearly two centuries passed before it was transformed into a "carol" by the addition of the burden, "Enixa est puerpera." John Grimestone's dialogue between Jesus on the Cross and the Virgin (1372) is made over into a carol (No. 157) in Sloane 2593 by prefixing (most inappropriately) the burden "Nowel, el, el, el, el, el, el, el, el, el, el, el, el, el, el." In the case of No. 125, which appears without a burden in the St. John's Camb. MS, a three-line burden was added in Sloane 2593, although between stanzas 4 and 5 and stanzas 10 and 11 its repetition breaks into the narrative. "And thus to hem he seyde: [Burden] 'Fro qwens come ye, kynges thre?'" Again, "And thus to hem gan seyde. [Burden] 'My Lord haȝt warnyd you of your fon.'"

"The presence of an invariable line or group of lines which is to be sung before the first stanza and after all stanzas," declares Dr. Greene, "is the feature which distinguishes the carol from all other forms of Middle English lyric" (p. cxxxiii). And in printing his texts he is careful to note any direction which appears in the MS for repeating the burden. It is noteworthy, however, that in a large majority of his texts such directions are lacking. And it seems unsafe to assume that the burden was repeated after each stanza, unless, of course, the fact is established by the musical notation. The songs of Laurence Minot are regularly preceded by a riming couplet which serves as the "heading." And other lyrics also not infrequently are headed by lines outside the stanzaic pattern which set forth the theme or motto of the piece. Such, for example, is the couplet

benc man of min harde stundes
benc of mine harde wndes

which appears at the head of No. 3 in *Relig. Lyrics of the XIV Cent.* A similar couplet stands at the head of No. 23 in the same collection, although in this instance each stanza concludes with a 3-line refrain. This poem by Herebert, Dr. Greene recognizes (p. cxxxiv), "comes close to the carol-form," yet he excludes it because the couplet at the head is not repeated. But there are some doubt-

ful cases even in Dr. Greene's collection. No. 395 carries the heading

Wymmen beth bothe goode & truwe
Wytnesse on Marie

Each stanza ends with the *cauda* "Wytnesse on Marie," which after the first is indicated in the MS simply by the letter "W." May not the heading (which, one notes, lacks rime) be merely the theme or motto of the song and not a refrain repeated at the end of each stanza? No. 377 also has a non-riming burden:

Thynk we on our endyng I red, I red, I red,
Thynk we on our endyng I red or we [gon].

But at the end of the several stanzas the repetition of only the *second* of these lines is indicated, and this line is linked by rime to the concluding line of each stanza. The first line of the "burden" therefore has no function beyond that of a motto or heading. Again, in No. 147, it is to be noted that the refrain,

Bot wel I wate as well I may
Slepe & be now styll
Suffre þe paynes þt I may
It is my fader wyll,

exactly balances the burden placed at the head. In such a case one may question whether the burden *as well as the refrain* was repeated after each stanza.

Without laboring the point further, the reviewer feels that Dr. Greene in his assertion, "The burden makes and marks the carol" (p. cxxxiii), makes a shibboleth of what is in many instances a formal rather than an essential criterion. With the carol, as with the ballad, it is impossible to frame a consistent and logical definition based solely upon considerations of form. There are "broadside" carols as truly as broadside ballads, in which the essential spirit and character of the carol as a choral composition have been lost even though at the head of the text is placed a group of lines serving as an ostensible "burden." Such, for example, is No. 328, at the head of which Audelay wrote:

Thy v wittis loke that thou wele spende
& thonke that Lord that ham the sende

Or one might cite No. 402, which warns against putting trust in women until nettles bring forth roses in winter, thorns bear figs, and other obvious impossibilities come to pass. This wholly non-lyrical poem in 7-line stanzas qualifies as a carol under Dr. Greene's definition because in Kele's print it carries the heading:

Whane thes thynges foloyng be done to owr intent,
Than put women in trust and confident

Logical consistency may have demanded the inclusion of this piece in his collection, but one feels that Dr. Greene has saved his definition only by sacrificing the essential spirit of the carol.

To the reviewer at least, the most valuable section of Dr. Greene's Introduction is Chapter III, "The Latin Background of the Carol," which displays impressively the influence of Latin hymns, sequences, and antiphons upon the typical English carol, whose vogue—to judge from the texts assembled in Dr. Greene's collection—dates very definitely from the later fourteenth century. The directness as well as the greater extent of the influence from this source contrast sharply with that which Dr. Greene discusses in Chapter IV, "The Carol as Popular Song." In fact, in the case of the very few early pieces in his collection which stand outside the field of this influence, such as No. 440, "Blow, northerne wynd," and No. 450, "Nou sprinkes the sprai," one doubts the advantage of extending the term carol, as ordinarily used, for the sake of including them. The popular lyric, like the popular ballad, is a large domain which has not been, and probably never can be, accurately surveyed, whereas the carol is a term applied in ordinary use to a fairly definite type of song. Dr. Greene is to be commended for his attempt to fix boundaries for the type. But it is questionable whether one can establish these boundaries by wholly ignoring general usage and considering only metrical form or for that matter whether any real resemblance in form exists between some of the 474 pieces in this collection of "Early English Carols."

The texts have for the most part been carefully printed and collated. In the case of pieces not hitherto printed I note some instances in which Dr. Greene's reading of the MS does not agree with mine—I omit mere differences of orthography:

No 43, st. 1, l. 4, *repose* (*not repayse*), cf *NED* *repose*, v¹; st 2, l 4, *Iu[d]ee or Iude* (*not Jure*). No 94, st 2, l 1, *misericordia* (MS *mia*) *not* Maria; st. 2, l 2, *dampide* (*not dampnde*), st. 2, l 3, *sapience* (*not* Sapiencia) No. 124 B, st. 3, l 2, *one þer fface* (*not ouer ther fface*); st 9, l 4, *errod-yul* (*not* Errod) No 146 B, st 3, l. 4, *Sene* (*not* S[ith]); st. 5, l. 7, *And sul be hay* (*Greene alters*); st. 6, l. 7, *þor-on a-say* (*not* I mon asay); st 8, l 2, *supply don for the sake of the rime*, st 11, l. 6, *pit a-way* (*not* this a way). No 147, st. 2, l. 8, *at* (= *þat*) (*not* A[n]t, cf. st. 3, l. 6 and st. 4, l. 5). No. 161, st 3, l 5, *An stil* (*not* Euer stil). No. 181, st. 2, l. 3, *in wolde* (= *in keeping*) (*not* inwolde) No 260, st. 3, l. 2, *bi gode* (*not* Is gode) No. 333, st. 9, l. 4, *me* (*not* we) No 377, st. 2 and 3, l. 6 *These are supplied lines and should be enclosed in brackets*, st 3, l. 3, *eldyrs* (*not* eld this), st. 4, l. 4, *sekturs* (*not* sektour). No 418, st. 1, l 3, *þe bet* (*not* the betur); st 2, l. 1, *Hamard* (*not* Hamardus); st. 3, l. 4, *meþynche* (*not* Myche); st. 4, l. 1, *a-route* (= *take root*) (*not* groute); st. 4, l. 3, *þrift* (*not* prest); st 5, ll 1-2 *First written* "yn hevene aboue / for his swete modur loue" and the rimes were then changed No 452, Burden, l. 1, *Wybbe* (*not* Rybbe); st. 2, l. 1, *vieth* (< OE *flet*) (*not* vleth); st. 2, l 2, *vnbeth* (*not* vnbech); st. 2, l 3, *zeth* (*not* yech); st. 3, ll 2 and 4, *þredele* (*not* predele); st 6, l. 2, *pleyze* (*not* play); st. 7, l. 2, *ale-schoth* (*not* ale-schoch); st. 7, l. 3, *wroth* (< OE

wrōt) (*not wroch*) No. 453, st. 1, l. 4, he (*not hit*), st. 3, l. 1, priyede (= *pried*) (*not preyede*); st. 3, l. 2, worly (*not werly*), st. 3, l. 4, þe mony (= *many*) (*not the mouth*), st. 4, l. 4, gremercy iacke þat was (*not Gramercy Jacke was*), st. 8, l. 4, it wol (*not it wel*); st. 9, line 4, Euel yspunne ʒern (*not Euel therinne es ern*); cf. *Prov. of Hendyng* 272. "Euer out comeþ euel sponne web"

CARLETON BROWN

New York University

Methuen's Old English Library, general editors, A. H. SMITH and F. NORMAN. A—Poetic Texts. 1. *Three Northumbrian Poems*, edited by A. H. SMITH, pp. x + 54, 2s.; 2. *Deor*, edited by KEMP MALONE, pp. x + 38, 1s. 6d.; 3. *Waldere*, edited by F. NORMAN, pp. viii + 56, 2s. London: Methuen & Co., 1933.

This new series will provide a variety of OE texts, edited on strict scholarly lines, and published in a pleasant form and at a low price, thus it will fulfill the intention of the general editors to "allow wider scope in the formation of courses of study." The editions are all formulated according to a general scheme which is clear and easy to follow; they all deal extensively with the texts and their problems, without getting lost in the mass of accumulated material. There are two major innovations in the printing of the actual texts, both of which will, very likely, meet with opposition: the long vowels are left unmarked, and the OE symbol for *w* is used. The latter change, at least, calls for comment. We find it of no particular advantage. The student, it is true, will thereby become better acquainted with the old writing and will find it easier to read OE manuscripts. But what other advantage is there in this symbol? Why introduce the old *w* but not the old *f*, *r* and long *s*? To be wholly consistent one would have to publish a facsimile of the text. To us there seems no need for making the reading of OE texts more difficult to the general student than necessary; there are difficulties enough as it is. This, however, is the only point in which we would differ from the general editors. All in all we have no hesitation in giving the series a warm welcome.

The first volume of the series contains Cædmon's *Hymn*, Bede's *Death Song* and the *Leiden Riddle*. The linking of the riddle with the other two poems may at first seem somewhat strange, but is justified by community in age, dialect and problems. The most important part of the volume is the introduction, which deals with the MSS, authorship, date and localization of the extant texts, orthography and language. The material is clearly arranged and thoroughly worked out; the editor deals with all important aspects of the three poems. Noteworthy is the use of ultra-violet light in reading the MS of the *Leiden Riddle*; thereby it was pos-

sible to confirm or correct older readings and thus give us a better text of this very badly preserved poem. The editor rightly accepts Cædmon as the author of the *Hymn* and well states his reasons for doing so. In the case of the *Death Song* there has been little doubt that Bede actually was its author. As to the riddle, this is clearly a translation of one of Aldhelm's Latin riddles, Dr. Smith is inclined to accept Aldhelm himself as the translator. He dates the Moore MS version of the *Hymn* between 734 and 737, here as elsewhere his argument is clear and sound. He puts both the Leiden MS of the *Riddle* and the St. Gall MS of the *Death Song* in the ninth century, but regards the Leiden MS as the earlier. The chapter on orthography and language is of particular value to the linguist. It is followed by the texts: each poem is given in both a Northumbrian and a later OE version, with variant readings and footnotes in which the careful and methodical procedure of the editor is apparent. To the note on *scepen* (p. 39) should be added a reference to *Angla* LIII 335 f (cf. also *healden* in *Judith* 290).

The particular value of this new series lies less in the texts themselves (which have been accessible for some time now) than in the union, within the same volume, of text and extensive commentary. This is notably the case in the second volume of the series, Professor Malone's edition of *Deor*. Here a scholar of high repute has given us not only a well edited text but also a sound and scholarly discussion of its important problems (often very intricate). The discussion proceeds from an attempt to date the poem. In scrutinizing the text from this standpoint the editor deals, one by one, with all the other important problems connected with *Deor*. No definite result is reached as to the date. The editor, while rejecting Schücking's reasons for a tenth century dating, himself inclines, on other grounds, to "A. D. 900 or thereabouts," but adds that the indications "do not warrant positiveness in our conclusions" (p. 22). The methodical procedure of the editor in his argument is particularly apparent in his investigation of the identity of ðeodric. Professor Malone identifies this character with Theodric the Frank. This is not the place to enter upon a detailed inquiry into this complicated question; we will say only that Dr. Malone puts forward a solid case without jumping to rash conclusions. The same applies to the discussion of other *Deor* problems. One is gratified to see that the editor definitely rejects the old theory (first proposed by Chadwick) which divides into two parts lines 28-34 (the "general reflections on adversity") and tends to consider the second part an interpolation. There seems to us to be no doubt, as Dr. Malone rightly remarks, that the lines in question have to be regarded as a unit and that "the poet's general reflections on adversity are plainly in keeping with his subject" (p. 15). The whole introduction is not only a good presentation of the editor's arguments, but is also clear and easy to follow. The text is printed from the facsimile edition of the *Exeter Book*; it is

provided with textual and exegetical footnotes, and is followed by a bibliography, a glossary, and a glossary of proper names. To the Welund references (p. 38) ought to be added W. van Helten, *ZfdW* XII 131 f. and A. Heusler, *ZfdA* LII 97 f.

Waldere, the third text of this series, tells a story of German origin, and it is therefore appropriate that Mr. Norman, its editor, is a Germanist. The matters that Mr. Norman had to consider in his Introduction are of great complexity. The editor first devotes himself to a careful analysis of the MS, in order to determine the probable sequence of the two sheets of fragments that we possess. His argument for the traditional sequence is convincing; this sequence indeed is the only one possible if we accept the reading *swilce* in II, line 1—and this reading seems likely enough. As to the date, the editor rightly considers this impossible to determine on linguistic grounds. He is inclined to consider the MS as the work of a Northumbrian scribe who was trying to write "Standard" Old English. This theory is not quite convincing, though some of the forms suggest the north. The editor discusses at length the identity of the speaker at the beginning of Fragment II. Up till now the speech has been ascribed to either Guðhere or Hagen; Mr. Norman believes *Waldere* to be the speaker. The only difficulty in accepting this theory lies in the introduction of *Waldere* as speaker in line 11; but re-introduction, as Mr. Norman points out, is nothing uncommon in OE poetry. On the whole we feel inclined to accept Mr. Norman's hypothesis. In this connexion he rightly argues that the ending of the *Waldere*, as of the *Waltharius*, must have been a happy one. The remaining questions are even more complicated. Mr. Norman very wisely refuses to enter upon a discussion of the theories of mythological origin and historical background, and contents himself with a short report on these matters. As to the history of the tale, Mr. Norman attributes its creation to a Bavarian poet, who composed a Walter lay "not long after A. D. 600." The story, he thinks, reached England in the seventh century, and in England another Walter lay was composed; this lay was the source of the *Waldere*. In this section of his work Mr. Norman seems to us to be on rather unsafe ground, and his arguments are not always convincing. However, whether we accept all the suggestions put forth by him or not, this edition will be of great value to the student, as it concisely brings together all important facts and theories concerning the *Waldere* legend and supplies a number of interesting and valuable new ideas.

REINALD HOOPS

Freiburg i. Br.

all of them have been raised on soapboxes—oratory and poetry are not identical, but they are, and always have been as in the Bible, sisterly.

Concentrating upon these patterns, Dr. Bartlett concludes that Old English poetry is non-narrative in feeling, is unified but as a series of tapestries in panels, statically. She regards *Beowulf*, though best, as typical. All epics, being partly metaphysical, like Milton's, are less *narrative* than are romances. One of the outstanding features of *Beowulf* seems to me, nevertheless, to be its movement, drama. The author will stay to elaborate but he commonly does so to make the situation more moving, more dramatic, and he takes pains to pull the listener back to the story, often by the very rhetorical devices Dr. Bartlett lists. The purpose of dialogue is mainly to suggest action, movement, *monstrance*, and there are 1231 lines of it in *Beowulf's* 3182! Perhaps *Beowulf* should be called dramatic (balladic drama? solo opera?) rather than narrative. But certainly, however rhetorical, it is not static; nor, by the way, though the source of its movement is more exclusively its ontology, is *The Wasteland* static, but spreading, paradoxically Gothic, unpanelled.

ARTHUR E. DuBOIS

Duquesne University

Dreams in Old Norse Literature and Their Affinities in Folklore.

By GEORGIA DUNHAM KELCHNER. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935. Pp. 154. \$3.50.

This book gives information which should have been available long ago. Because many Old Norse texts are not easily accessible and because many of the texts have not been translated into English, no English or American scholar has hitherto published any important material on this subject. W. Henzen's *Über die Träume in der Altnordischen Sagalitteratur*, published in 1890, from which Miss Kelchner quotes frequently, is a slight work not dealing in anything like a thorough manner with Old Norse dreams.

After stating in her first paragraph that Norse dreams are important because "they are the only dreams of the heathen Teutonic people on record" and because "they include a proportion of Christian dreams making their way among the people after the coming of the new faith," Miss Kelchner announces that her object is "to examine these dreams and to trace their affinities in folklore." She divides the dreams into three principal classes: (1) adversity and prosperity dreams, (2) dreams containing symbolic images, and (3) dreams in which living or dead persons appear to the dreamer. In discussing each group Miss Kelchner tries to deal with the dreams in chronological order and to show the difference

between purely pagan conceptions and later Christian influences. She then compares the dreams of Norse literature with the dreams of Norse folklore. Many interesting and original conjectures and ideas are set forth. The appendix, which makes up nearly half the book, contains the original Icelandic text with translation of a selection of the dreams. For this collection of texts of dreams together with translations all interested in Norse or in dreams should be very grateful. The bibliography at the end is inclusive. Just why, however, Miss Kelchner used for reference the Funk and Wagnall *Standard Dictionary of the English Language* instead of the large Oxford dictionary is difficult to understand. Then, too, one might expect to find Zoega's *Old Icelandic Dictionary* listed among the dictionaries.

The most disappointing thing about Miss Kelchner's work is its brevity. For this shortcoming she may not have been responsible, but there is so much more that might have been said concerning Old Norse dreams that it seems a pity that Miss Kelchner has not treated her subject more fully. No discussion of dreams is complete without consideration of the language used in dreams and in speaking of dreams. Causes of dreams, the kind of dreamers, the time and place of dreams, the part which dreams play in the works in which they appear, and questions of belief in dreams could all have been profitably discussed. A complete list of dreams, even without texts and translations, would also have been desirable. Perhaps omission of the folklore material and more analysis of the Old Norse dreams themselves might have been advisable.

What Miss Kelchner has done, however, she has done very well. Although this fully documented book, with its compact and abstract style, is not one for an idle hour, it is one in which scholars will delight. Miss Kelchner has made a distinct contribution to scholarship.

EDWARD C. EHRENSPERGER

University of South Dakota

Saga Eiríks Magnússonar. Eftir Dr. STEFÁN EINARSSON. Reykjavík, Ísafoldarprentsmiðja, 1933. xi + 351 pp., 7 portrs.

Dr. Stefán Einarsson some time ago published in English an article on that phase of the activity of Eiríkr Magnússon, his kinsman, which is best known to the English speaking peoples, his collaboration with William Morris in translating Old Icelandic literature. This, however, was only a comparatively small part of a long lifework in various fields. Magnússon was a gifted, energetic man with a strong will and still stronger sympathies and dislikes, and with many and varied interests. He became one of the most prominent of his contemporary countrymen at home and abroad.

It was therefore a happy thought of Dr. Einarsson to present us with a full-length portrait of him on the centenary of his birth.

Magnússon was born in Iceland, trained there for the ministry, and had actually been appointed to a living there when a chance led to his going abroad, where he lived for the rest of his life. He was sent to London in 1862 to supervise the printing of the New Testament in Icelandic for the British Bible Society, and this led afterwards to one temporary position after another until he obtained a librarianship in the Cambridge University Library which he held until his retirement in 1909, a few years before his death which occurred in 1913 shortly before his eightieth birthday. He became early acquainted with George E. J. Powell, a wealthy Welshman, and together with him made his first translation into English of Jón Árnason's *Icelandic Legends*. It was not until 1869 that his collaboration with Morris began, and it continued for a quarter of a century, until Morris' death in 1896, Magnússon several years later finished alone the last volume of their *Saga Library*. He had other irons in the fire, made translations from the English into Icelandic, edited old texts, and wrote several articles on textual criticism, especially with regard to the Poetic Edda. His contributions there were always noteworthy, and sometimes very good. We get a good account of all this literary activity in the biography. Magnússon, however, was not the only Icelandic scholar in England at that time, there was also Guðbrandur Vigfússon at Oxford, and these two early crossed swords, and they finally became bitter enemies. Their unfortunate controversies Dr. Einarsson describes in an impartial and fair manner, showing that they were so different in temperament and opinions that a clash between them was inevitable. Though the part dealing with Magnússon's literary activities brings much that is new, those portions of the biography which tell about his work in other fields are even more revealing. He constantly busied himself with the affairs of his native land, advocating innovations and changes in education, politics, and almost everywhere else, and he was one of the staunchest supporters and closest friends of Jón Sigurðsson, the Icelandic statesman and scholar. Dr. Einarsson has had at his disposal Magnússon's correspondence and, besides, painstakingly consulted other written and printed sources, so that the biography adds much to our knowledge of the history of that period. His presentation is lucid and very readable, giving a good portrait of the subject of the biography, and at the same time showing fairness to those with whom Magnússon quarreled, and they were quite a few. Appended are, in accordance with good Icelandic tradition, the genealogies of Magnússon and his wife, who was quite a character, and at the end there is a bibliography of his numerous writings.

HALLDÓR HERMANNSSON

Studien zum Altenglischen Computus. Von HEINRICH HENEL.
Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1934. Pp. ix + 95. (Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie, Heft xxvi.)

From the beginning of the seventh century, the dating of the movable feasts of the church calendar was a matter of great concern to English ecclesiastical authorities. This was partly owing to the fact that when the Roman missionaries arrived in Britain, they found the Celtic priests employing a method of reckoning the Easter date different from that used in Rome, with the result that in certain years the Irish and Welsh churches celebrated Easter a week earlier than their English neighbors. The discrepancy lasted throughout the seventh century, until gradually the Celts accepted the Roman reckoning. Wilfrid, Aldelm, and Bede spent much of their energy in arguing for the Roman computation, and it is probably safe to say that aside from the study of biblical and patristic texts, these early scholars looked upon ecclesiastical chronology as the most important department of learning for a cleric. Nor did the tradition die out during the troubled centuries that followed. Learned preoccupation with solar and lunar cycles, concurrents, epacts, bissextile years, and all the other chronological esoterica lasted right down to Ælfric's day, for the latter specifies that the *gerim* (Lat. *computus*) should be part of the equipment of every priest.

In the work at hand, Professor Henel has sought to widen our knowledge of this branch of Old English learning. His opening section takes up the concept of *gerim*, and makes clear that the term meant, not a definite book or treatise, but the whole body of chronological knowledge necessary to fix the dates of the movable feasts. Thereafter he moves in upon his problem from two sides. After demonstrating that Byrhtferth's *Manual* is mainly a teacher's commentary on the *gerim*, he analyzes this treatise paragraph by paragraph and thus builds up a picture of the *gerim*-text that the lecturer had lying before him. Then he fills in the outline by arranging and presenting extracts from a number of eleventh-century manuscripts which contain *computus* materials, this chapter, the longest in the book, is particularly valuable, since many of the manuscripts have not been printed before. In a closing section, the author prints as a Prose Menologium fol. 991 of MS. Harley 3271 (with a collation of MS. CCC 422, p. 48), and compares it with the Verse Menologium of MS. Tiberius B. I. (ed. Imelmann, Berlin, 1902) and with the *gerim*-texts presented earlier. The volume concludes with an Appendix containing notes on nineteen Old English words hitherto unrecorded in their *gerim* meanings, and an index of the manuscripts used in the study.

The above survey gives no hint of the many interesting byways explored by Professor Henel in his text and notes. In order to

substantiate his conclusions, he has often had to set right the errors and oversights of his predecessors in the field. An outstanding instance is his deft reconstruction of the text of Byrhtferth's *Manual*; he demonstrates beyond question that what editors of Byrhtferth have always regarded as a hopelessly muddled and lacuna-filled text moves along intelligibly and coherently if two large sections in the middle are transposed. Significant also are Henel's observations on the age and relationships of the various manuscripts containing the *gerim*, there seems no doubt that these matters can be determined within closer limits than heretofore if we employ the criteria afforded by the *gerim* portions.

Professor Henel has added a valuable new weapon to the armory of Old English scholarship, a weapon whose usefulness will grow as we learn more about the intellectual life of pre-Norman England. It is to be hoped that he will continue his investigations beyond the bounds of the present study, for no one else to-day seems so well-equipped to complete a definitive work on Old English *Zetrechnung*.

PUTNAM FENNELL JONES

University of Pittsburgh

The Origins of Jansenism. By NIGEL ABERCROMBIE. Oxford: Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford Press], 1935. Pp. xii + 341. \$5.00. (Oxford Studies.)

The Revival of Pascal, a Study of His Relation to Modern French Thought. By DOROTHY MARGARET EASTWOOD. *Ibid.*, 1936. Pp. xii + 212. \$4.50. (Oxford Studies.)

Mr. Abercrombie devotes the first half of his book to discussions of predestination, free will, grace, etc., by Saint Augustine and his opponents, by Aquinas, Baus, the Jesuits, and Jansen, the second half to the history of Port-Royal and of French Jansenism in the seventeenth century. Although very little is said about Pascal and Racine, the work will, for their sakes, interest students of the period who may have difficulty in finding elsewhere similar material presented so succinctly. Mr. A. seems, however, in Part I, to be addressing theologians rather than laymen, for he indulges freely in scholastic terms, *unicity*, *salvific*, *attrition*, *tutorist*, etc., two of which, *peccaminosity* and *philosophoumenon* (pp. 141, 158), are not in the *Oxford Dictionary*. It is to be hoped that these two contributions to our language will be duly recorded, although, after encountering a certain number of unfamiliar terms, the reader feels sympathy with the pope quoted by Mr. A. (p. 229) as remarking to a Jansenist agent, "Non ho mai studiato in Theologia."

The writer's manner becomes simpler when he emerges from Part I, but he hardly does justice to the human drama that lies behind Part II. This may be because he feels that it is superfluous to insist upon it after Sainte-Beuve, Bremond, and others, but he shows little sympathy for Pascal, remarking (p. 252) that the latter had no knowledge of the principles of casuistry, and for the heroic nuns, though he admits their courage in defying three popes and three rulers of France.¹

Mr. A.'s neglect of Pascal is more than compensated for by Miss Eastwood's glowing admiration for him. This may be due to the fact that the former thinks only of the *Provinciales*, while the latter is primarily concerned with the *Pensées*. After a brief account of their eclipse during the third quarter of the nineteenth century, she discusses their fortunes down to 1923, finding, not only revival of interest in Pascal, but the greatest admiration for him. His affinities to Bergson, Georges Sorel, and others are indicated and his influence shown on several philosophic or religious writers. Warm sympathy both with Pascal and with his modern admirers and a decided gift of expression characterize her book, which must certainly be considered a remarkable achievement when one learns that Miss Eastwood was crippled from early childhood, "spent most of the years from four to fourteen lying on her back," and carried on her studies despite constant physical pain. She died in 1934, before her MS was altogether ready for the press.

H. C. LANCASTER

Die religiöse Entwicklung von Karl Philipp Moritz auf Grund seiner autobiographischen Schriften. Studien zum 'Reiser' und 'Hartknopf.' Von Dr. ROBERT MINDER. Neue Forschung. Arbeiten zur Geistesgeschichte der germanischen und romanischen Völker, Heft 28. Berlin. Junker und Dunnhaupt, 1936. Pp. 280.

Dr. Robert Minder, the author of this important study on Karl Philipp Moritz, which was undertaken at the suggestion of Professor J. Rouge of Paris, is a former student of the Ecole Normale Supérieure and agrégé of the University of Strasbourg, from which institution he holds the docteur ès lettres. He is now teaching at the University of Nancy. Simultaneously with the work under review he has published his Strasbourg doctoral thesis, *Un Poète Romantique Allemand: Ludwig Tieck*, a 500-page analytical study

¹ He confuses (p. 244) Nicole's father, Jean, with Claude Nicole, "le président Nicole," who translated Horace, Catullus, and Ovid; cf. Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal* (ed. 1860), IV, 303, and the catalogue of the Bibliothèque nationale.

of Tieck, the man, and his writings from various points of view. The present reviewer hopes to be able to notice this last-mentioned work separately at an early date. Suffice it to say here that with these two painstaking studies Dr. Minder has immediately taken rank among the most able and promising younger scholars in the field of German literature of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. We make this statement without any qualification whatever, for Dr. Minder happily combines excellent training, wide reading, sound judgment and discrimination, and a style (in both French and German) which reveals at once the best qualities of both nations. He vies with the German expounders of "Geistesgeschichte" on their own ground, but with a clarity and perspicuity native only to the French temperament.

The purpose of the monograph, in brief, is to show how the religious mysticism of Moritz was transformed into esthetic mysticism after he had passed through the school of Rationalism, but that he always remained positively indebted to the quietism of Mme Guyon. Incidentally the significant rôle of *Hariknopf*, as a symbolic-romantic counterpart to the "psychological" novel *Reiser* (which began as a pietistic diary), is stressed.

In cursory summaries the author reviews the present status of research into Moritz and into pietism (formerly a much-neglected subject) and separatism. Then he analyses *Anton Reiser* and finds the psychological basis of the religious experiences which gave rise to the novel in Moritz's mind. This basis is rooted in quietism, pietism and mysticism.

Since quietism came into Germany through the works of Mme Guyon, those writings of hers which find mention in *Reiser* are studied particularly, above all the *Geistreiche Diskurse über verschiedene Materien* and *Kurzes und sehr leichtes Mittel, das innere Gebet zu verrichten*. Then the dualism of Reiser-Moritz, conditioned by pietism and arising out of the clash between "restriction" and "expansion," is taken up.

After pietism is clearly distinguished from quietism, Moritz's mother and the artisan circles of his youth are considered as representatives of pietism. The influences of the Church, as reflected in Reiser's confirmation, are also studied. The gradual transition to Rationalism is illustrated by free-masonry, which is termed a secularized form of the "praxis pietatis."

Coming now to mysticism, the author investigates its relation to pietism and counts up the not inconsiderable mystic elements in *Reiser*. Then he turns to the no less mystic *Hariknopf*, which, as we have already suggested, he considers a sort of continuation of, and counterpart to, *Reiser*. Undoubtedly, as he shows, Moritz's doctrine of art had marked religious ramifications and, since he is a forerunner of Romanticism, important lines of connection run between the quietism of Mme Guyon and the ideal of the "esthetic

man" which was developed by Moritz as well as the Classicists and Romanticists.

When in 1928 the reviewer made an earnest plea that Moritz be given a reconsideration and be taken out of the pigeon-hole of Rationalism and placed among the important forerunners of Romanticism (*Germanic Review*, III, 4), his entreaty was, it seems, not heeded by all. He is therefore pleased to find Dr Minder writing sentences like these: "Jedenfalls stand er der romantischen Generation so nahe wie Goethe selbst" (252), or this. "Dieser Begriff des 'Sichgehenlassens' deutet auf die tiefste Verwandtschaft Moritzens mit den Romantikern hin" (253), or finally this: "So steht der Quietismus—wenigstens als Strukturform, bisweilen aber auch geradezu als Lehre—mit seinem Fluch und Segen am Anfang wie am Ende der romantischen Bewegung" (256).

Twenty pages of notes, mostly of a bibliographical nature, and an index conclude this valuable study of some important spiritual phases of the inchoate German Movement. No one interested in the rise of German Classicism and Romanticism can well afford to overlook it. The author, of course, had the advantage of access not only to the well-known literature of the subject, but also to a mass of material not to be found in any American library. He also had the benefit of the advice and criticism of such men as Rouge, Vermeil, von Grolman and Unger.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL

University of Cincinnati

The Early Middle Class Drama (1696-1774). By FRED O. NOLTE. Lancaster, Pa.: 1935. Pp. v + 213. \$2.00 (New York University, Ottendorfer Memorial series of Germanic Monographs No. 19).

At first glance the plain title of this study seems unpretentious, on second thought it seems intrepid. A critical period of confusing cross-currents forms the background of the examination. The most characteristic literary product of the age is taken in hand and with no nationalistic restrictions, for a study of the middle-class drama in England, France, or Germany alone would be a meaningless fragment. The precise termini are justified thus:

1696 . . . marks the appearance of Cibber's *Love's Last Shift*, which is generally considered the first "sentimental comedy." In 1774 Ramler, in the fourth edition of his translation of Batteux's *Cours de Belles-Lettres ou Principes de la littérature*, presented a series of arguments for and against bourgeois tragedy. Ramler's discussion comprises practically all the contentions which for years had been raised in defense or in condemnation of the new dramatic genre, and affords a convenient occasion for a retrospective summary.

Perhaps a more impressive reason could have been assigned for approximately the same final date. As the author later shows, Ramler's summary is in many respects shallow and ill-considered, and the title therefore ends in an anticlimax. This is a matter of little consequence. The dates 1696-1774 immediately suggest a well defined age, the period of the "Aufklärung."

But then a tentative objection intrudes. In Germany the middle class drama was not only an affair of the "Aufklärung" but also of the "Sturm und Drang" with Lenz's *Hofmeister* (1774) and *Soldaten* (1776) and Wagner's *Kindermörderin* (1776). Thus the title warns us in advance that the final development of the middle class drama in Germany is not to be taken into consideration, and as a matter of fact the existence of these plays is not even recognized, although passing reference is made to Schiller's *Kabale und Liebe* (1784) on a suitable occasion in the concluding chapter. We console ourselves with the reflection that the dates in the title at least include *Minna von Barnhelm* and *Emilia Galotti*, but here we are doomed to disappointment. *Minna von Barnhelm* receives passing mention in two footnotes, *Emilia Galotti* no mention at all. From first to last the onus is placed upon *Miss Sara Sampson*, which is accepted as the norm of the German middle class tragedy. An index to the work would show more references to this play than to all other German dramas taken together.¹ Needless to say, this one-sided treatment affects the conclusions. Of *Minna von Barnhelm* and of *Emilia Galotti* at least one cannot say that they are dramas without a crest (p. 210), nor can one condemn the taste of the audiences (see below) which acclaimed these plays.

All things considered, it would have been better if the author had called his work *The theory of the middle class drama 1696-1774*. The best complement of Nolte's work is perhaps Kettner's *Lessings Dramen im Lichte ihrer und unserer Zeit* (1904). Kettner takes his stand on Lessing's dramas and turns retrospectively toward their predecessors with relatively little regard for theory. Nolte proceeds somewhat theoretically and leads us toward but not completely up to the climax.

Nolte's first task is to describe the "Aufklärung" and his characterization is more discriminating than many of its predecessors. More superficial observers have been content to say that it was the age of reason, that it was an optimistic age which believed in the greatness of man, and that it was a philosophic age, but Nolte points out that the previous century was definitely the age of pure

¹ It is unfortunate that the book has no index; a hasty and unreliable count made by the reviewer revealed the fact that the French plays were most frequently referred to. Plays by Beaumarchais, Destouches, Diderot, Mme de Graffigny, Landois, Mercier, Nivelle de la Chaussée and Voltaire appeared, but none by Marivaux. England was represented by Cibber, Steele, and Victor, but chiefly by Lillo and Moore. Germany was represented by Lessing's *Miss Sara Sampson* alone except as indicated in the text above.

reason. "Descartes and Spinoza in philosophy, Racine and Boileau in literature—belong to the seventeenth century." The term reason is too often loosely used. "Pascal is never more rational than when he condemns reason, Diderot is never more sentimental than when he exalts it." (The first chapter is full of such discriminating comments as this.) Instead one should say that the eighteenth century is the age of intellectual inquiry. Again it was the Renaissance that believed in man and glorified him in art and poetry. The "Aufklärung" did not exclaim: "What a piece of work is man! How noble in reason! how infinite in faculty!" Rather it contended that man was a creature of possibilities, and by dint of patient work something noble might be made of him. And finally the "Aufklärung" was not the age of pure philosophy, but rather of popularized and applied philosophy. The characteristic names are Shaftesbury, Voltaire, Burke, Mendelssohn, and Pope.

If the following chapters are less brilliant than the first, they are not less meritorious. The author presents a résumé of the vast controversial literature of the period and arranges it in a clear and pleasing form. A summary of the summary is impossible here for the author has already reduced it to the smallest possible compass. We note however one or two points in which he comes to conclusions quite different from those of his predecessors. He minimizes the differences between "bürgerliche Tragödie" and "comédie larmoyante" and does not agree with Lessing's passing thought (Lachmann-Muncker VI 7) that both arose from the peculiar temperament of the English and French respectively. In opposition to this idea he points out that England was the birth place of the new comedy as well as the new tragedy. "Steele's last comedy of sensibility antedates Destouches' *Le Philosophe marié* by five years and Nivelle de la Chaussée's *Le Préjugé à la mode* by fourteen." This must be granted, but it still seems to be true that sentimental comedy thrived better on the French stage than it did on the English and that domestic tragedy did not thrive at all on the French stage. Significant are Saurin's happy ending to Moore's *Gamester* (*Beverley*) and Mercier's similar treatment of Lillo's *London Merchant* (*Jenneval ou le Barneveldt français*); also the fact that Nolte stresses: "Diderot, the most confirmed apostle of the *tragédie domestique*, never wrote a play with a tragic conclusion." The reviewer at any rate persists in believing that something in the nature of the British public, combined with its relatively greater advance toward political and social independence, contributed to this difference of development.

Literary historians have taken pleasure in discovering early forerunners of the middle class drama. Hettner proposed for this distinction *Arden of Feversham*, *A Yorkshire tragedy*, *The London Prodigal*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Othello*, *Timon of Athens*, *King Lear*, and Calderon's *El Alcalde de Zalamea*. Nolte easily disposes of the assumption that these belong in the same category as the eighteenth

century plays. Nearer in spirit to the middle class drama, he says, are two plays of Haywood, *The English Traveller* and *A Woman Killed with Kindness*. Despite his intent he almost succeeds in convincing the reader that these plays were actual forerunners of the later drama of sensibility.

The résumé of the theory of the middle class drama naturally makes up the greater part of the study. The dramas themselves, their content and character, are touched upon only where concrete examples are needed to clarify the concepts. It would be a laborious task for any individual merely to assemble the significant essays of Aristotle, Hurd, Corneille, Diderot, Lessing and a score of others dealing with the subject. To compare their ideas and weigh the value of their arguments would require weeks of often painful toil. One can read Nolte's digest in a few pleasant hours and conclude with the feeling that no important aspect has been overlooked and one closes the book with a due sense of gratitude to the author.

Nolte is not content, however, with the bare reproduction of the ideas. At the conclusion he offers a well considered evaluation of the arguments for and against the new type of drama. It is interesting to note that he regards practically no argument *pro* or *con* of the eighteenth century as valid. The commonest defense of middle class tragedy is that it appeals more strongly to a middle class audience, which is more affected by disasters that threaten itself. This assertion is not borne out by experience. Nolte says: "When Ramler contends that Moore's *Gamester* and Lessing's *Miss Sara Sampson* have been more effective in the theatre than any play by Corneille or Racine, he is not demonstrating the relative merits of the plays involved, but is merely attesting to a lack of judgment and taste on the part of the audience." We have sympathy with King Lear or George Barnwell, not because of their rank or their low degree, but in the measure in which their characters are plausibly, humanly, and artistically presented.

The "Fallhohe" argument in favor of heroic tragedy fares no better in the light of experience. Reason should tell us that the downfall of the mighty is more tragic because the descent is greater, but the misfortunes of Juliet nevertheless affect us as deeply as those of Cleopatra. The proponents of heroic tragedy argue further that the fall of kings should move us more deeply because masses of humanity of our own kind are involved in the fall. Yet we receive calmly the information that there is something rotten in the state of Denmark and even the poet does not let the item divert attention from his hero. In *Antony and Cleopatra*, to be sure, the importance of the outcome for many people and indirectly for ourselves is stressed but still our interest in the characters submerges even here our interest in ourselves. It cannot be maintained that *Antony and Cleopatra* is a greater play than *Hamlet* merely on account of the greater public issues involved. "In comparison with the fate of resplendent heroes, not only thrones and courts but nations them-

selves dwindle. 'Vides quanto facilius sit totam gentem quam unum virum vincere.'"

Was the popularity of the middle class drama then without basis? Not entirely. In reality the author says, the plays were poorer than the masterpieces of Corneille, Racine, and Molière, but on the other hand they were better than the eighteenth century imitations of the seventeenth century classics. The one strong argument that the proponents of the middle class drama should have made, Nolte concludes, is one that they never made. They should not have said: "write middle class plays because your public can appreciate these more fully." They should have said: "write middle class plays because you belong to the middle class and you can write more artistically, effectively, plausibly, and movingly about the affairs of life you are familiar with."

LAWRENCE MARSDEN PRICE

University of California

The Meaning of "The Witch of Atlas." By CARL GRABO. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1935. Pp. x + 158. \$2.50.

Mr. Grabo's new book like his earlier, *A Newton Among Poets*, performs a service to Shelley scholarship in its emphasis upon the erudition and depth of thought which characterizes the greater part of the poet's work. The study is praiseworthy also for its general interpretation of *The Witch of Atlas*: in considering it a "fantasy upon themes" which run through Shelley's work, in calling attention to the many-sided character of the Witch herself, in its painstaking reconstruction of the mythology which lies behind the poem.

However, the evidence set forth and the conclusions implied by the main body of Mr. Grabo's work leave much to be desired. The chief weakness of the study—which is more dogmatic and sweeping in its assertions than the earlier volume—is its lack of foundation on external evidence, a drawback which the author himself does not fail to note. Ingenious and fertile in suggestion as the parallels set forth often seem, they fail to satisfy. We know, after all, a great deal about Shelley. There is a mass of correspondence, a considerable body of self-revealing prose, biographic accounts from people who knew him intimately. It seems only reasonable to suppose that somewhere in this wealth of material there would be reference to Shelley's later interest in science and to that type of occult, late-eighteenth century Neo-Platonism which Mr. Grabo confidently asserts Shelley must have read "for years" (p. 111).

In answer to the first assumption of the author—that Shelley's

boyhood interest in science persisted in his later reading—there is further discouraging negative evidence. Mary Shelley, who was certainly in a position to know the facts and who is a thoroughly reliable biographer, writes in her Preface to the posthumous poems of 1824, "He was an elegant scholar and a profound metaphysician, without possessing much scientific knowledge, he was unrivalled in the justness and extent of his observations on natural objects." Mr. Grabo likewise ignores the possibility that much of this seemingly scientific material may be mere richness of vocabulary, a brilliant use of remainders of an earlier interest in science, but not fraught with weighty scientific import.

Much of the interpretation of "scientific" symbol is arbitrary and strained. For instance, "liquid love" (*Witch*, xxxv) is identified with electricity (p. 56). Such a statement cannot be supported by the lines which follow. The passage is clearly a reminiscence of Agathon's speech in the *Symposium*, 196, 197, one well-beloved by Shelley, which he rendered, "Love . . . is . . . liquid . . . if he were otherwise, he could not . . . secretly flow out and into every soul." Love sings "divinest harmony . . . to all things which live and are."

Few scholars would deny the predominance of Neo-Platonic elements in Shelley's metaphysics and aesthetics; few would doubt Mr. Grabo's general analysis of this belief in Shelley's *Witch*. But the author has not given full attention to the possible multiple sources of the poet's Neo-Platonism, to the protean character of Platonism in general. One cannot assent with readiness to the implication that this body of ideas comes to Shelley largely through the medium of the writings of Thomas Taylor and Cudworth. Again there is much direct evidence which casts serious doubt on such an assumption. For example, Shelley considers that *Adonais* owes something to *Faust* (letter to J. and M. Gisborne of July 13, 1821). Certainly, the Neo-Platonic implications of the Earth-Spirit's speech in Part I, Act 1, seem echoed in stanza lrv of the elegy. Then, too, a great part of Shelley's mature philosophic thought has its roots in Berkeley and Drummond, of whom the poet frequently speaks with warmth. A few examples from Mr. Grabo's text will further illustrate the point. The idea "God . . . is alone the fountain and original of all things" (p. 26) is assigned to Cudworth, but is one which all Neo-Platonic philosophers hold in common. Again Cudworth is cited as the source of the idea "Time is but an image of that unmade duration, which we call eternity" (p. 50)—a notion which has its source in the *Timaeus*, 37, a dialogue which we know Shelley read.

The emphasis on science and Neo-Platonism in Shelley gives an over-balanced impression which the author probably does not intend. He says nothing of important literary sources of the poem—of Herodotus, of Spenser—he ignores the influence of art, particularly statuary, upon the images. He depicts Shelley as the author

of a scientific and occult enigma when it was one of Shelley's ideals of poetry that "every expression in a poem ought to be in itself an intelligible picture" (To T. Medwin, April 16, 1820).

There are many admirable things in the volume which cannot be discussed here. Its value would be enhanced if the author had first, separated Neo-Platonic from Platonic elements in Shelley's thought, second, made a more exhaustive study of the possible sources of these ideas rather than an arbitrary assignment of source, third, distinguished more carefully between what is certain, what is fairly certain, and what is conceivably possible; fourth, not gone so far afield to explain things which can be more simply and convincingly accounted for in another manner.

ADELE B. BALLMAN

Baltimore

Shelley et la France. Lyrisme anglais et lyrisme français au XIX^e siècle. Par HENRI PEYRE. Le Caire: Barbey, 1935. Pp. 509.

To see an English poet through not unsympathetic foreign eyes is always an interesting and valuable adventure. But to see such a poet as Shelley through French eyes is particularly fascinating. What have French critics and poets, with their flair for clear reason, made of the English poet whom many of his countrymen have praised for subtlety of emotion and music but blamed for a lack of thought? The answer is found in the leisurely pages of this many-sided work by the well-known Professor of French Literature in the University of Egypt.

M. Peyre's purpose is far more than that of collecting and analyzing French criticisms of Shelley's poetry. He has also attempted to compare and contrast the movements of French lyricism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries with what he deems the distinguishing qualities of Shelley's poetry. This approach, while it necessarily involves many negative results, and results in a bulky work, nevertheless makes for a most valuable comparative study. If the author is reproached for devoting too many pages to negative results and to an unnecessary review of the French lyric of the period, he may take comfort in realizing how helpful and acceptable his study is to the serious student of Shelley.

The author's study of French romanticism from 1820 to 1843 reveals but little French interest in Shelley. But the rise of the French lyric during this period culminates in a metaphysical and symbolist movement similar to an earlier achievement in the lyricism of the English romantic school. The most significant work in this English revival of poetic thoughtfulness was the poetized philosophical idealism of Shelley. Therefore it was natural that the French symbolists, in their attempt to restore wealth of meaning to

French poetry, should turn for support and inspiration to the English school, and particularly to Shelley, their great predecessor. Henceforward his name was inseparable in France from the notion of poetry great in thought as well as treatment. This comparative study of Shelley and the French symbolists is an outstanding contribution. From 1895 to the present, appreciation of Shelley, we are told, has steadily increased among French critics, literary historians, and poets. The point of contact is found in Shelley's pre-eminent power to incorporate profound abstract ideas in sensuous imagery and suggestive verbal music. The contact itself consists not so much in any large obvious indebtedness of French poetry to Shelley, as in a similar development in French poetry under the hands of poets who have known, appreciated, and assimilated the work of their English forerunner. Therefore this French student and critic believes that today Shelley is more easily and thoroughly understood by the French than by the English man-of-letters!

BENJAMIN P. KURTZ

University of California

The Literary Career of Sir Samuel Egerton Brydges. By MARY KATHERINE WOODWORTH. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1935. Pp. 192. 10 s/6 d.

Dr. Woodworth's study shows again that a book of value and even interest can be done on a man whose own works, on the whole, had no such qualities. A voluminous writer for virtually the duration of his long life, Brydges toiled after literary distinction even more diligently than he attempted to establish his claim to the Chandos barony. He practised with ardor and an occasional—but how occasional!—felicity in heraldry and genealogy, in the local antiquarianism so dear to the *Gentleman's Magazine*, in the production of periodicals, in bibliography and autobiography, in criticism, in economic and political speculation, in the prose essay, in sentimental verse and in the sentimental novel. He corresponded with or knew Wordsworth, Southey, Scott, Hayley, Bloomfield and Edward Quilinan, printed some forty volumes at his private press, collected a library and was an M. P., a baronet and an original member of the Roxburghe Club. But it was all no use. Labor as he would at what Miss Anna Seward called "authorism," the only distinction—and that qualified—that he can be thought of as achieving lies in the fields of bibliography and genealogy. Except, perhaps, in the impressive bulk of his unpublished works; for there must be few men of letters who have two thousand manuscript sonnets in the British Museum.

Dr. Woodworth is candid about Brydges' essential unimportance as a person. Her point in making this study of him—apart from satisfying a requirement for the doctorate—is, bluntly, that he was so manifold, energetic and conventional in his mediocrity that he made himself an interesting “example of the cultured taste of the times,” unusually typical of the gentleman of letters of the Romantic Period. From that sensible point of view she surveys his life, novels, poetry and criticism. Of the first three little need be said. His life was chiefly interesting in, and towards the end almost entirely centered on, the prosecution of his claim to be Lord Chandos of Sudely and his attempts, at least one of them unscrupulous, to be solvent. His novels dealt mostly with “delicately nurtured aristocrats” whose days were spent “in venerating their ancestors and in struggling with their susceptible emotions.” In short they were fictions such as were written throughout the period by a thousand people whom there is no particular reason to remember. They concern the so usual, and so tedious, *Adelines* and *Emilys*, *Le Foresters* and *Fitz Albinis*; Jane Austen wrote of one of them that she was not disappointed for she had expected nothing better. It is typical of Brydges' unhappy infelicity, if the expression is possible, that though closely acquainted with Miss Austen for some time, he did not think about her until it was much too late. As for the verse, imitative, derivative and conventional, it deals like the fiction with romantic sentimentalities, in the poorer taste of the day. Almost the best that can be said of it is that here and there one can find “some vestige of poetic expression.”

Dr. Woodworth's section dealing with Brydges' criticism is most disappointing, not in her contribution to it but in Brydges'. There at least a mind active if patently non-creative, with leisure, interest and connections, could have accomplished something. But while some of his literary antiquarianism was no doubt of temporary value, his criticism was on the whole merely characteristic, and often so banal, pompous and rhetorical as to be more characteristic of the bad criticism of the day than the mediocre. It was also strangely barren, in this account, even in comment on the great and near-great of the period whom he knew.

Dr. Woodworth's study is marked by intelligence and carefulness—almost the only scholarly virtues that such a subject could demand, or encourage. As an account of the Baron Chandos it is perfectly adequate; and there is a peculiar necessity that it should be so—namely, the great likelihood that there will never be another account of the Baron Chandos. A slight suspicion remains that there are other figures of the period, still available in great number, who would have better rewarded the work of no doubt many months in six major libraries of the English-speaking world. Would not a search through Mr. Colburn's *Biographical Dictionary of the Living Authors* have revealed many a man of letters of the Romantic

Period who produced something of interest, left some individual mark, some record of a thoughtful and independent mind, made some impact on the moral, artistic or intellectual temper of the age? But this is a question—not reflecting on Dr. Woodworth and her study—that is outside the reviewer's province.

FORD K. BROWN

St John's College

The Browning Box, or the Life and Works of Thomas Lovell Beddoes as reflected in letters by his friends and admirers.
 Edited with an introduction by H. W. DONNER. London [and New York]: Oxford University Press, 1935. Pp. lxxvi + 190.
 \$5 00.

This book is one of a group of volumes on Beddoes, all from the same pen,—the others being *The Works of T. L. Beddoes*, Oxford University Press, 1935, and *Thomas Lovell Beddoes; the Making of a Poet*. The present work portrays Beddoes as seen by his friends and throws much new light on the personalities of those friends

An introduction of some sixty pages discusses Beddoes' relationship to four persons or groups of persons. We learn that, contrary to what has usually been supposed, Beddoes always remained on good terms with his own family. Thereafter, his relationship to Barry Cornwall is discussed. More interesting is a new fund of information concerning Bourne, the poet's friend at college, a man so strong in his admiration that he pencilled a comment "glorious!" opposite a none too witty stage direction in *Torrismond* and who, in a novel, sympathetically depicted Beddoes as one of the main characters. Quite equal in interest is the sketch of Kelsall, a consistent lover of beauty and himself a minor poet, a friend whose constant devotion won Beddoes what fame he eventually achieved.

The main part of the volume is composed of 141 letters from the friends or adherents of Beddoes, throwing light, though sometimes remotely, on the poet's life, death, and posthumous reputation. Only 6 of these 141 have ever been printed before, though many have been drawn upon by the poet's biographers. They vary much in importance and interest. The most significant are those from early admirers championing his fame, certain ones concerning his death (it is shown that he committed suicide by taking poison), and those between Browning and Kelsall. These last, in fact, are extremely interesting, presenting on the one hand the great poet exuberant with spirit and cordiality and, on the other, the elderly champion of Beddoes, feeling his strength failing and pathetically glad to hand on the torch of his friend's reputation to a younger man.

The title, with its allusion to the box of Beddoes material given to Browning, seems unfortunate. The twelve plates depict persons or places significant in the poet's life. Altogether, the volume enables us better to understand Beddoes' eccentric genius and his place in literature.

ALBERT MORTON TURNER

University of Maine

East Tennessee and Western Virginia Mountain Ballads (The Last Stand of American Pioneer Civilization). Edited by CELESTIN PIERRE CAMBIAIRE. London: The Mitre Press, n. d. Pp. xlv + 179.

The most casual examination of Professor Cambiaire's little book will reveal that it is the work of an interested amateur and not of a specialist in the field either of folk literature or folk music. It is a pity that Mr. Cambiaire did not refrain from publication until he had familiarized himself with the background and technique of folk-song scholarship. His book might then have been a worth while contribution instead of a demonstration of how such material should not be presented.

The introduction is ingratiating, but overloaded with superlatives, romantic notions, and typographical errors. His discussion of pioneers and early settlements in Tennessee is of considerable interest and value, though based upon old authorities. Stressing his own special interest, he overemphasizes French influence in the Southern mountains. He surely goes too far when he suggests that both the habit of hospitality and the fiddle-playing of the mountaineer are derived from the French. The fact that pioneer traditions are dying out even in the mountains seems not to interfere with his hope of salvaging American civilization by a return of the pioneer spirit.

The body of Mr. Cambiaire's book consists of some seventy-two miscellaneous ballads and songs and a dozen ballads for dances and games. Except for this single distinction, there is no fathomable order or grouping of the pieces: Child ballads are sprinkled about among broadside material and native American songs of very recent vintage. The author is completely silent as to his technique as a collector, and only a few sources of the ballads are named. There are no tunes; and even the texts are unreliable, for the author admits (p. 124 n.) that "in some ballads and songs like, for instance, this one, the writer had to supply verses, and even stanzas, as the mountaineers remember, at times, only parts of the old poems." From this and many other evidences it is clear that the author is either not aware of the nature of folk tradition or not interested in the scientific study of it. There is no suggestion that he has heard of any other worker in the field, either Percy and

Scott, whose tradition in some degree he follows in taking liberties with his material, or Child and Sharp and others, whose now more respected tradition of scholarly accuracy and respect for the folk element he largely ignores.

Part III consists of twenty-five poems by Mr. Cambiaire himself. It is hard to see why their author should have felt impelled to publish them, even as a modest but irrelevant addendum to his book of ballads.

ARTHUR KYLE DAVIS, JR.

University of Virginia

The Beginning of Systematic Bibliography. By THEODORE BESTERMAN. London [and New York]: Oxford University Press, 1935. Pp. xii + 81. \$7.00.

This is the third of six beautifully made "Oxford Books on Bibliography" now in hand. It is a dreary work, constructed out of the careful rakings from a long-neglected field, compiled from compilations which were, by the author's showing, sometimes of no use to anybody except the original compiler. However, Mr. Besterman has an observant eye and a receptive imagination, and he has sowed his field generously with seeds of thought that are waiting to be cultivated by anyone who chooses to dig about them.

Bibliography has of late become a "Key-Industry" for teachers of advanced English. With it, a few highly-expert technicians, following the lead of Alfred W. Pollard—McKerrow, Greg, and Dover Wilson in the fore—have unlocked the heart of several mysteries that had withstood all the older bludgeons and battering rams of scholarship. Wherefore, Bibliography has become a name to conjure with, and every Graduate School has lectures on its devious processes. For such a course of instruction, Mr. Besterman's book furnishes the material for the introductory section. He starts off by driving another spike in the outmoded notion that most things cultural began with printing, for Galen in the Second Century found it necessary to compile a classified bibliography of his writings, and the Englishmen's record goes back to the Venerable Bede in the year 731 A. D. Two other things Mr. Besterman does that are comforting—he puts a footnote on his first page justifying his adoption of the phrase "systematic bibliography" as a term for the multifarious ramifications from mere lists of titles concerning a person, place, or thing, and he combats the efforts of contemporary technicians to deprive the compilers of mere lists of the right to use the word Bibliography.

There is further food for thought in this work for those librarians who are labouring under the impression that theirs is a profession created by the nineteenth-century multiplication of books. Mr. Besterman will tell them of classified library catalogues, with

abundance of analyticals, in mediaeval times. A typical character is Johann Trithem, who began his career in 1483, bringing to it "a true love and knowledge of books, the practical experience of a librarian and cataloguer, and something of the inexplicable ardour for system, for order, which is so important an ingredient in the make-up . . . With all his faults—vanity, credulity, intolerance—he was a true scholar and a true bibliographer"

Harvard University

G. P. WINSHIP

BRIEF MENTION

Four Icelandic Sagas, Translated with an Introduction and Notes by GWYN JONES. Princeton: Princeton University Press; New York, American Scandinavian Foundation, 1935. Pp. ix + 164 + 2. The Sagas here translated are Hrafnkel Freysgodi's Saga, Thorstein the White's Saga, The Weaponfirther's Saga, and The Saga of the Men of Keelness. Two of them, the second and the fourth, have not appeared in English before, and the other two are found in rather inaccessible publications. The first three relate the history of powerful families in the east of Iceland; they are all good stories, especially Hrafnkel's Saga, which by many critics is considered to be the finest specimen of a shorter Saga. The fourth Saga is very different from the rest; it is frankly unhistorical except as far as the form is concerned. It was designed for diversion primarily, and it still is a pleasing story. Like most of his predecessors, Mr. Jones has been preoccupied by the problem of creating an English style suitable to the Saga. In his own words he has "avoided on the one hand prosiness and latinized vocabulary, and on the other hand that extraordinary 'precious' language of the fullblooded school that itself seems sometimes to need translation." The result is a fairly literal translation, seldom degenerating into flatness but generally retaining the pith and terseness of the originals. On the whole the translation is accurate, although not quite faultless: I found 18 errors or obscurities in the 73 pages (the two first Sagas) I collated with the originals. Among the worst I mention that on page 56, where *dagmál* is wrongly translated "midday"; it should be "breakfast time," that is, around nine o'clock in the morning, while *rismál*, "the rising hour" is about six in the morning. On page 64 "asking him to get help" is a misunderstanding for "asking him to take over the household" (*lið* = people of the household). Spike-Helgi on page 72 is called "fitful and moody" while we should actually have "re-

sourceful and inventive" as illustrated by the following tale. Here again *bellu-bragð* is translated "scatter-brained trick," but the idea is better expressed by "a mean trick." The notes are helpful, and the introduction is a very good guide to the ideology of the Sagas, as well as to their art of expression. All things considered the book reflects credit on its author and is a worthy addition to the Saga-Library of the American Scandinavian Foundation.

STEFÁN EINARSSON

The Johns Hopkins University

The Letters of John Keats. Second edition, with revisions and additional letters. Edited by MAURICE BUXTON FORMAN. New York: Oxford University Press, 1935. Pp. lxx + 561. \$5.00. This work is much more than a reprint, for the two handsome volumes published in 1931¹ have been carefully revised throughout: mistakes corrected, the arrangement improved, the notes of the elder Forman distinguished from those of his son, many new facts (including an illuminating account of Fanny Brawne) given, more of the previously-published letters have been collated with their originals, and ten unimportant new ones by Keats as well as several by his friends have been added. To crown all, the price has been greatly reduced. Notable improvements, a valuable work

R. D. H.

Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature. Volume xv (1934). Edited for The Modern Humanities Research Association by MARY S. SERJEANTSON and LESLIE N. BROUGHTON. Cambridge, England: Bowes and Bowes, 1935. Pp. x + 296. 7 sh. 6 d. This work, well arranged and admirably printed and bound, is indispensable because of its completeness and its accuracy. It would, however, be of much greater use if it could be brought out more promptly. My own copy, paid for in October, arrived in March, so that part of the period covered is two years old when it reaches some of its readers and, like yesterday's fashions, seems strangely out of date.

R. D. H.

Annals of English Literature, 1475-1925, the principal publications of each year together with an alphabetical index of authors with their works. [By J. C. GHOSH and E. G. WITHERCOMBE.] Oxford: Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford University Press], 1935. Pp. vi + 340. \$3.00. A useful reference volume from which

¹ See *MLN*, XLVII (1932), 116-17

much can be learned as to literary movements, the general temper of a period, and the books published while an author was writing. The work is fuller for English titles and apparently more accurate than Ryland's *Chronological Outlines*, which has long been out of date and out of print, but the plan is otherwise not so good. More historical events, more continental titles, and some attention to date of writing when this differs considerably from that of publication would have greatly increased the value of the *Annals*, which, however, contains much information in compact form.

R. D. H.

The Literary Recollections of Barry Cornwall. With an introduction and notes by RICHARD W. ARMOUR. Boston: Meador Publishing Co., 1936. Pp. 133. \$2.00. It was a good idea to select these brief comments from Proctor's *Autobiographical Fragment*, edited in 1877 by Coventry Patmore. The remarks on Hazlitt are unusually interesting and leave a distinctly favorable impression,—“No man,” we are told, “was competent to write upon Hazlitt who did not know him personally.” Of Keats we read, “I never encountered a more manly and simple young man.” Proctor knew every important literary figure of the “Romantic Period,” but his opinions would carry more weight had they been written during the lifetimes of the persons considered, instead of many years later.

R. D. H.

Literary Pioneers. Early American Explorers of European Culture. By ORIE WILLIAM LONG. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1935. Pp. viii + 267. \$3 00 There is no great historical problem more interesting and important than the transmigration of European culture to the United States. American historians and students of American literature have hardly begun to scratch the surface of this fertile field. Therefore such a book as Professor Long's must be a welcome addition to our knowledge. Professor Long has dealt chiefly with American intellectual relations with Germany, as indicated in the travels and studies of certain Americans of the period before 1860. His pioneers are George Ticknor, the first American to get a German doctor's degree and the first serious American student of French and Spanish literature; Edward Everett, first American to introduce Goethe to the American public; Joseph Green Gogswell, who, from his studies abroad, derived an interest in the library problem which led him, as librarian at Harvard and as the consultant of John Jacob Astor, to make fundamental contributions to the organization and growth of two of the most distinguished libraries in America; Bancroft, who from his German studies derived an enthusiasm for German

literature which he did much to communicate to the American literary public, Longfellow, who, despite the restrictions of New England moral standards, appreciated and popularized Goethe; and Motley, whose intimate German contacts were numerous, and whose friendship with Bismarck is so interesting

In telling his story Mr. Long is usually interesting. There is perhaps a little too much that is episodic, the large points do not stand out sufficiently; and the book is far too full of quotations. Despite these limitations, however, Mr. Long's work is itself a piece of pioneering, an important and useful contribution in an important field.

DEXTER PERKINS

The University of Rochester

The Lyfe of Sir Thomas Moore, knyghte. By WILLIAM ROPER. Edited by ELSIE VAUGHAN HITCHCOCK. Early English Text Society. London: Milford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1935. Pp. lii + 142 + 8. \$4 00. First published in 1626, almost fifty years after the author's death, Roper's great biography is represented by thirteen MSS, of which no complete collation has previously been made. Dr. Hitchcock gives us a critical text which comes as near the manuscript of More's son-in-law as modern scholarship can penetrate. She describes and discusses the MSS and the previous editions. Her sketch of the life of Roper and the historical notes, in which she has profited from Mr. Chambers's research, are discerning and adequate. She has produced a scholarly and decidedly readable edition and an excellent example of the purely literary service detailed textual work can render.

RICHARD H. PERKINSON

Fordham University

Make it New Essays By EZRA POUND. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935. Pp. viii + 408. \$3.75. *Make it New* is blurbed as a study in Pound and, through him, of the post-war period. Pound himself is greatly interested in *zeitgeist*, the need for expanding consciousness, and the notion that an age or author is often best studied in minor writers or minor works. Dated by previous publication in magazines, separate chapters deal with troubadours, Elizabethan minors, early translators of Greek, Henry James, Remy de Gourmont, French poets contemporary with Pound, and *Calvacanti*. These chapters are rather loosely illustrative of themes (the relationship of music to speech, states of con-

sciousness in ages, dependence of literature on economics) defined in a first chapter which also suggests functions or classes of criticism. But these themes are sometimes obviously after-thoughts and impose an artificial consistence on the book. The prose is loose, jerky, jumbled, often like reading-notes jotted down without transition, but full of the results of curious research and gemmed with many passages of insight the little of criticism (p. 336) "which is good is to be found mostly in stray phrases. . . ." The best-written chapter, on Henry James, is also most illuminating. It shows the contracting influences of expatriation and, also, the inevitability of this expatriation from America where persons of social temperament can hardly find congenial friends because few persons in America are capable, as the Jameses noticed, of playing with ideas, of "intellectual larking." Why "make it new"? "It is quite obvious that we do not all of us inhabit the same time" (p. 19).

ARTHUR E. DUBOIS

Duquesne University

The Play of Antichrist from the Chester Cycle. Edited by W. W. GREG. Oxford. Clarendon Press, 1935. Pp. c + 90. Some of the results of the investigation which led to the present edition were printed by Mr. Greg in 1914 in his *Bibliographical and Textual Problems of the English Miracle Cycles* (II. — pp. 32-69). The method of his textual study was set forth in *The Calculus of Variants* in 1927, and in the present volume he offers a practical demonstration of its use. After a note on the story of the Antichrist, and a detailed analysis of the textual problem, he prints the two earliest texts of the play, that of the Peniarth manuscript and that of the Devonshire manuscript. Underneath are recorded peculiarities or difficulties of reading, and, below these, under the Peniarth text the variant readings of Harleian MS. 2124, under the Devonshire text the important variants of all five manuscripts exclusive of P and D. As to the Calculus as applied in this volume skeptics will say that it is excessively ingenious; that the editor is himself forced to abandon the scheme at times (cf. pp. li ff); and thus that mathematical accuracy is less attainable than may at first appear from the apparatus. The conclusions seem to agree with those reached by Dr. Deimling, who, however, failed to consider P and D, and whose edition is inaccurate (p. xiv, n. 2). Dr. Greg relies occasionally on the Oxford Dictionary for recorded use of certain words in Middle English, where its collection is far from complete.

H. R. PATCH

Smith College

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received]

Abbott, Claude C.—A catalogue of papers relating to Boswell, Johnson and Sir William Forbes *Oxford*. Clarendon Press, 1936 Pp xxviii + 257 \$7 00

Boswell, James.—Journal of a tour to the Hebrides with Samuel Johnson, LL.D., now first published from the original manuscript Ed by Frederick A. Pottle and Charles H. Bennett *New York* The Viking Press, 1936 Pp xviii + 435 \$5 00 (Private Papers of James Boswell From Malahide Castle, Isham Collection)

Bradby, Anne.—Shakespeare criticism, 1919-35 *London* Oxford U Press, 1936. Pp xiv + 388 \$0 80 (World's Classics)

De Selincourt, E.—The early Wordsworth. *London* Oxford U Press, Nov 1936 Pp 28 \$1 00 (English Association Presidential Address, 1936)

Hardy, Thomas.—Far from the madding crowd Ed by Carl J Weber *New York* Oxford U Press, 1937 Pp xxvi + 388 \$1 00 [One of the most complete editions of any modern novel, with illuminating introduction, full notes, and attractive format]

Keller, Wolfgang (ed) — Shakespeare-Jahrbuch, Band 72 (Neue folge XIII band). *Weimar* Hermann Bohlaus, 1936. Pp. viii + 262.

Mossner, Ernest C.—Bishop Butler and the age of reason. *New York*: Macmillan, 1936. Pp xvi + 271 \$2 50

Ohlander, Urban.—Studies on coordinate expressions in Middle English *Lund*. C. W. K. Gleerup, 1936 Pp. 213 10 Kronor. (Lund Studies in English, V.)

Sale, William M.—Samuel Richardson, a bibliographical record of his literary career with historical notes *New Haven*. Yale U. Press, 1936 Pp xxiv + 141. \$5 00.

Shakespeare, William.—Henry the fourth, part I Ed. by Samuel B. Hemingway. *Philadelphia and London*. J B Lippincott Co., 1936 Pp xii + 554 \$7 50 (New Variorum Shakespeare)

—Sonnets Ed by Tucker Brooke with introduction and notes *London* [New York]: Oxford U Press, 1936. Pp. x + 346. \$5 00.

Spenser, Edmund.—The Faerie Queene, Book V Ed by Ray Heffner. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins U Press, 1936 Pp. xii + 375. \$6 00. (Variorum Spenser.)

GERMAN

Adrian, Karl, u. Schmidt, Leopold.—Geistliches Volksschauspiel im Lande Salzburg [Texte und Arbeiten zur religiösen Volkskunde. Bd 2] *Leipzig*. Pustet, 1936. 344 pp., 12 plates M. 7.80.

Amoretti, G. V.—II "Tristan" di Gottfried von Strassburg. *Pisa*: Nistri Lischii, 1934. 147 pp. L. 15

Aus der Werkstatt. Alfred Götze zum 60. Geburtstag gewidmet von Otto Diehl u. andern. [Giesener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie 46] *Gießen*: von Munchow, 1936 80 pp M 3 20

Bianchi, Lorenzo.—Dante und Stefan George Einführung in ein Problem. *Bologna*: Zanicchi, 1936. 62 pp L. 6

Bieling, Alfons.—Das deutsche Rolandshied im Spiegel des französischen Rolandsliedes. Diss Göttingen. *Düsseldorf*: Nolte, 1936 v, 77 pp

Brandolini, Ester.—Wolfango Goethe Conferenza *Castellamare di Stabia*: Tip. U. Fedeli, 1934 22 pp

Cayrim, Ortrud.—Jean Pauls publizistische Leistung 1796-1825 Diss Heidelberg *Worms*: Kranzbühler, 1936 xv, 165 pp.

Croce, B.—Nuovi saggi sul Goethe. [Biblioteca di cultura moderna, n 244.] *Bari*: G. Laterza e filii, 1934. xi + 191 pp. L. 12

Cysarz, Herbert.—Deutsches Barok in der Lyrik *Leipzig*: Reclam [1936]. 135 pp M 4

Di San Lazzaro, Clementina.—Gerhart Hauptmann, e i suoi drammi. *Bologna-Rocca S Casciano*: L. Cappelli, 1934. 221 pp L 15.

—Stefan George. *Imola*: P. Galeati, 1935 ix + 221 pp L 15.

Errante, V.—Personalità di Goethe e lirica goethiana Prolusione *Milano*. V Colonnello, 1935. 63 pp L 3

—Lenau Storia di un martire della poesia *Milano-Messina*: G Principato, 1935. 462 pp L 30.

Fink, Gertrud.—Ludwig Finckh. Leben und Werk *Tübingen*: Heine, 1936. 110 pp. M 2 50.

Fuchs, Gerhard.—Studien zur Übersetzungstheorie und -praxis des Gottsched-Kreises. Versuch einer Wesensbestimmung des nachbarockischen Klassizismus Diss. *Freiburg, Schweiz*: [1936] 105 pp.

Gauhe, Ursula.—Jean Pauls Traumdichtungen Diss München *Bonn*: Universitäts-druckerei, 1936. 133 pp M 4.

Geissendoerfer, Theodore, and J. W. Kurtz.—Deutsche Meisternovellen, Edited with Preface, Biographical Sketches of the Authors, Notes, and Vocabulary. *New York*: Prentice-Hall, 1936. 336 pp. \$1.85.

Gerhart Hauptmann-Jahrbuch Hrsrg. in Gemeinschaft mit von Felix A Voigt Bd 1 Breslau Mauschke & Berendt, 1936 162 pp., 5 plates. 4°. M. 10

Goedsche, C. R.—Jugend und Reife Moderne Kuzzgeschichten. Ed. with Notes, Exercises and Vocabulary New York: Crofts, 1936 v, 152 pp \$1.00

Goethes Briefwechsel mit Marianne von Willemer. Neu hrg. von Max Hecker Mit 10 Abbildungen 9-11. Tausend Leipzig: Insel-Verlag [1936] 487 pp M. 7 50

Grierson, Sir Herbert.—Two Dutch Poets. (The Taylorian Lecture 1936) New York: Oxford Press, 1936 46 pp \$0.75.

Hagboldt, Peter.—Aus deutscher Vergangenheit. Boston: Heath & Co [1936] 58 pp

Hain, Heinrich.—Mundartgeographie des oberen Rednitzgebietes Nürnberg: Spindler, 1936 viii, 78 pp M. 2 50

Hederer, Edgar — Friedrich von Hardenbergs "Christenheit oder Europa" Diss. München Zeulenroda: Sporn, 1936. 99 pp

Heilfurth, Gerhard. — Das erzgebirgische Bergmannslied Ein Aufriß seiner literarischen Geschichte Diss Leipzig. Schwarzenberg, Erzgeb. Gartner, 1936 143 pp., 3 plates, 4°

Helbron, Hans.—Das Lied vom Grafen und der Nonne Diss. Kiel Quakenbruck: Kleinert, 1936 vi, 192 pp

Heukelum, Hans von.—Ruhmen, das ist's! Studien zu Späten Gedichten Rainer Maria Rilkes Diss Würzburg: Mayr, 1936. 46 pp. 8°.

Jahrbuch, Literaturwissenschaftliches, der Gorres-Gesellschaft. Hrsrg von Gunther Muller. Bd 8. Freiburg: Herder, 1936. 273 pp 4°. M. 8.

Kastner, Erich — Drei Manner im Schnee. Ed by Clair H Bell New York: Crofts, 1936 xii, 251 pp. \$1.25.

Kayser, Wolfgang.—Geschichte der deutschen Ballade Habilitationsschrift. Berlin: Junker u Dunnhaupt, 1936. x, 328 pp M. 8.

Knote, Walter.—Hermann Lingg und seine lyrische Dichtung Diss. Würzburg: Mayr, 1936. 102 pp

Kretschmar, Eberhard. — Die Weisheit Rainer Maria Rilkes. Weimar: Bohlau, 1936. 174 pp M. 3 80

Lerner, Luise.—Studien zur Komposition des hofischen Romans im 13 Jh [Forschungen zur deutschen Sprache und Dichtung H. 7] Münster: Aschendorff, 1936. 54 pp. M. 2.

Maione, I.—Profili della Germania romantica. [Biblioteca Paravia, "Storia e pen-

siero," n 26] Torino G B Paravia e C., 1935 xviii + 245 pp L 9 50

Malkowsky, E. F.—Peter Kraft der Segelflieger Ed by I Finn Authorized Edition New York. Oxford Univ Press, 1936 63 pp \$0.30

Menke-Gluckert, E.—Goethe in Dresden Zehn Jahre Ortsgruppe Dresden der Goethe-Gesellschaft Weimar 1926-1936 Eine Rückschau Dresden: Focke & Oltmanns, 1936 87 pp M. 2 80

Nitschke, Dolorosa — Studien zum Gottsuchertum in der schlesischen Literatur. Diss. Freiburg, Schweiz. 1935 138 pp

Padovani, U. A. — Arturo Schopenhauer. L'ambiente, la vita, le opere [Pubblicazioni della Università cattolica del Sacro Cuore Serie I. scienze filosofiche, XXI] Milano: "Vita e pensiero," 1934 x + 214 pp L 15

Pensa, M.—Stefan George Saggio critico Bologna. N Zanichelli, 1935 343 pp L 20

Reichmann, Ernst. — Heinrich Zschokkes Weltanschauung in den Jugendjahren Diss. Berlin. Borna: Noske, 1936. 154 pp M. 5 40

Scalero, Lihana. — Antologia della lirica tedesca dopo Goethe. Traduzione e note di —. Lanciano: G. Carabba, 1935. 230 pp. L 12

Schafer, Josef Wilhelm. — Das Nationalgefühl Grimmelshausens Diss Würzburg: Mayr, 1936 51 pp.

Schmidt, Adalbert. — Zur Kunstform des Gegenwartsromans Eine literargeschichtliche Studie Leipzig: Luser [1936] 53 pp. M. 1 50.

Schmidt, Friedrich Adolf.—Maler Mullers dramatisches Schaffen unter besonderer Berücksichtigung seiner Faust-Dichtungen Diss Göttingen. Göttinger Handelsdruckerei, 1936 vii, 297 pp.

Schwarze, Karl.—Der Siebenjährige Krieg in der zeitgenössischen deutschen Literatur. Kriegserleben u Kriegserlebnis in Schrifttum u Dichtung des 18 Jh. [Neue Forschung. 29]. Berlin: Junker u Dunnhaupt, 1936 235 pp 4°. M. 10.

Spiecker, Frank. — Luise Hensel als Dichterin Eine psychologische Studie ihres Werdens auf Grund des handschriftlichen Nachlasses Mit einem Anhang bisher unveröffentlichter Lieder Freiburg: Herder, 1936 207 pp. M. 4 80

Stentzel, Eva.—Der Entwicklungsgedanke in Goethes "Dichtung und Wahrheit" Diss Danzig, Teildruck Borna: Noske, 1936 viii, 40 pp

Storm, Theodor. — Immensee. Ed with visible vocabulary, notes, and questions by Elmer O Wooley Boston: Heath & Co. [1936]. 90 pp.

Sudermann, Hermann. — Fritzen Drama in One Act Edited for class-room use, with introduction and vocabulary, by George M Priest *New York* F S Crofts & Co, 1936 81 pp \$0 85.

Tapper, Heinrich. — Die Gestalt des Petrus in der Literatur des ausgehenden Mittelalters und des 16. Jh. Diss *Frankfurt*: 1935 103 pp

Vancsa, Kurt. — Ferdinand Raimund Ein Dichter des Biedermeier [Österreichische Biographien. H 2] *Innsbruck*. Tyrolia, 1936 62 pp 60 Pf

Venuti, Teresa. — La casa di Goethe (a Roma). *Roma*. "Italia," 1935 L 18

Vilmar, A. F. C. — Geschichte der deutschen National-Literatur Bearb u fortgesetzt von Johannes Rohr 2 Aufl *Berlin*: Safari-Verl. [1936] viii, 446 pp M 4 80.

Vincenti, L. — La letteratura tedesca nell'età barocca *Torino* Ed. de "L'Erma," 1935 v + 209 pp

Wentzlaff-Eggebert, Friedr Wilh. — Dichtung und Sprache des jungen Gryphius Die Überwindung der lateinischen Tradition und der Entwicklung zum deutschen Stil [Aus Abhandl d Preuss Akad d Wiss. Phil.-hist Kl Jg 1936, 7] *Berlin*: de Gruyter, 1936 121 pp. 4°. M 7 50

FRENCH

Abry, Crouzet, Bernès et Léger. — Les gr écrivains de Fr illustrés *Paris*: Didier, 1936 xii + 422 pp Fr 25.

Aubigné, d'. — Les tragiques (extraits), éd H. Bardon *Paris*: Larousse, 1936 94 pp Fr. 1 50

Aucassin et Nicolette, éd Mario Roques. *Paris* Champion, 1936 xxxviii + 112 pp Fr 12 (CFMA, 41)

Baldanzi, E. R. — Il pensiero religioso di G G. Rousseau *Florence*: Le Monnier, 1934. 187 pp. L 15

Balzac. — Sténie, éd A Prioult. *Paris*: Courville, 1936 xxxix + 256 pp Fr 30

Barrière, P. — La vie intellectuelle en Périgord (1550-1800) *Bordeaux*: Ed Delmas, 1936 588 pp. Fr. 55.

Baudelaire — Poésies choisies, éd A Siché. *Paris* Ed. Nelson, 1936. 320 pp Fr 7.

— Les fleurs du mal, éd. Le Dantec *Paris* Ed de Cluny. Fr 10

Benjamin, R. — Molière. *Paris*: Plon, 1936 258 pp Fr 25.

Berger-Creplet. — Profils litt *Paris*: Figuière, 1936 192 pp Fr 12

Bergounioux, L. A. — G Du Buys (1520?-1594), poète satirique *Paris*: Picard, 1936 xiv + 241 pp. Fr 25.

Bordeaux, H. — De Baudelaire à sœur Marguerite *Paris*: Flammarion, 1936. 259 pp Fr. 12

Bossuat, R. — La poésie lyrique au moyen âge *Paris*. Larousse, 1936. 104 pp Fr 1 50

Bourdaloie. — Sermons choisis, éd L Dimiel *Paris*. Garnier, 1936 460 pp. Fr. 12

Brodes, Pauline de. — De l'Esprit, a book of conversational French *New York*: Oxford Univ Press, 1937 x + 207 pp \$0 95.

Bruneau et Heulluy. — Grammaire fr. *Paris* Delagrave, 1936 416 pp

Brunot, F. et Bruneau, Ch — Précis de gram. hist de la langue fr *Paris* Masson, 1936 767 pp Fr. 52

Catta, T. — R Bazin *Paris*. Calmann-Lévy, 1936, 228 pp. Fr 15.

Chateaubriand — Le Génie du Christianisme (extraits), éd Th Delarouzée *Paris*: Larousse, 1936 124 pp. Fr 1 50.

— Les Martyrs, éd V Giraud *Paris*: Garnier, 1936 620 pp Fr. 9

Chrétien de Troyes. — Œuvres choisies, éd G. Cohen *Paris* Larousse, 1936. 108 pp.

Coffey, D. J. — R Bazin. *Angers*: Eds de l'Ouest, 1934 56 pp Fr 12

Damourette et Pichon. — Essai de grammaire de la langue fi T V *Paris* d'Artrey, 1936 864 pp Fr. 150

Diderot. — Writings on the theatre, ed F. C. Green *Cambridge*: Univ Press [N. Y.: Macmillan], 1936 vi + 317 pp.

Du Bellay. — Défense et illustration Poésies choisies, éd A Siché. *Paris*: Ed. Nelson, 1936 383 pp. Fr 7

Flaubert. — Les Meilleurs textes, éd R. Dumesnil *Paris*: Desclée, De Brouwer, 1936. lxxx + 585 pp. Fr 15

— Mme Bovary, éd R Tisserand 2 v. *Paris*: Larousse, 1936. 450 pp. Fr 8.

— Œuvres posthumes Mme Bovary T II *Paris*: Conard, 1936 600 pp Fr 75.

Freyssinier, P. — Langage et poésie. *Paris*. Figuière, 1936. 64 pp. Fr 6

Giulotti, D. — Il merlo sulla forza. Francesco Villon. *Florence* Vallecchi, 1934. 353 pp L 10

Hankiss, J. — Défense et illustration de la littérature *Paris*: Eds du Sagittaire, 1936. 265 pp. Fr 15

Hill, R. T. — Two O Fr poems on Saint Thibaut. *New Haven*: Yale Univ Press, 1936. viii + 182 pp \$2 50. (Y Romanic Studies, 11.)

Hugo V. — Les Chandeliers de l'évêque (Les Misérables), retold and ed. O F Bond III *Boston*: Heath, 1936 iv + 57 pp. \$0 28

Kellermann, W. — Aufbaustil und Weltbild

Chrestiens von Troyes im Percevalroman
Halle: Niemeyer, 1936 xi + 232 pp

Kruger, M.—Die Entwicklung und Bedeutung des Nonnenklosters Port-Royal (1609-1709). *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1936. xii + 365 pp

Lebel, R.—Les voyageurs frs du Maroc. *Paris*: Larose, 1936 408 pp Fr 25

Lion, J.—Bibliog des ouvrages consacrés à Anatole France. *Paris* Giraud-Badin, 1935 43 pp

Luc et Bertrand.—Textes choisis des grands écrivains *Paris* Delagrave, 1936. 512 pp. Fr 18

Lugh, V.—La Bruyère *Genoa*: Degli Orfini, 1935 301 pp L 12

—Montaigne *Lanciano* Carabba, 1935. 173 pp L 8

Marie, Aristide.—La Forêt symboliste Esprits et visages *Paris*: Firmin-Didot, 1936 296 pp Fr. 16.50

Massis, H.—Notre ami Psichari *Paris*: Flammarion, 1936 252 pp. Fr 18.

Maupassant.—Six contes choisis, éd F B. Barton *Boston*. Heath viii + 79 pp

Michaut, G.—La Bruyère. *Paris*: Boivin, 1936 256 pp Fr 18

Michelet.—Pages litt, éd M Allem *Paris*: Garnier, 1936. 414 pp Fr 12.

Millardet.—Le roman de Flamenca. *Paris*: Boivin, 1936. 56 pp. Fr. 8

Molière.—Médecin m l, Bourgeois g, abrégés et éd. E. R. Goddard et J. Rosselet (Intro à Molière) *Boston*: Heath, 1936 vi + 199 pp. \$0 80

—Scapin, éd R. d'Hermies *Paris*: Larousse, 1936 96 pp

Musset.—Lorenzaccio, éd J Nathan *Paris*: Larousse, 1936 120 pp Fr 1 50

Niklaus, R.—Jean Moréas *Paris*. Presses univ., 1936 252 pp Fr 25

Pell, Elsie.—A Gide L'évolution de sa pensée relig Lettres inédites. *Paris*: Didier, 1936 218 pp. Fr 12

Pons Bounous, A.—Néo-romantiques et Parnassiens *Rome*: Castellani, 1935 143 pp

Porché, Fr.—Verlaine. *Paris*. Flammarion, 1936 127 pp Fr. 3.75

Prnault, A.—Balzac avant la comédie humaine (1818-29). *Paris*: Courville, 1936 xx + 484 pp Fr 40.

Racine.—The Best Plays, trans into Eng. rhyming verse by Lacy Lockett *Princeton*: Univ Press, 1936 xii + 412 pp. \$3 00.

Rheinfelder, H.—Altfranzösische Grammatik. I. Lautlehre. *Munich*: Hueber, 1936. xv + 323 pp

Roe, F. C.—Twentieth Century Prose.

London and N Y: Longmans, Green, 1930 (1936). xviii + 143 pp \$0 90

Rousseau.—Œuvres autobiographiques, éd. A François. *Paris*: Delagrave, 1936. 124 pp Fr 2 50

Schoell, F.—La langue fr dans le monde. *Paris* d'Artrey, 1936 400 pp Fr. 40.

Stendhal — Racine et Shakespeare (extraits), éd R. Ternois *Paris* Larousse, 1936 104 pp

Tabarant, A.—Le vrai visage de Rétif de la Bretonne *Paris*. Aubier, 1936 500 pp. Fr 24

Thibaudet, A.—Hist de la litt fr de 1789 à nos jours *Paris*: Stock, 1936. 600 pp. Fr 33

Trahard, P.—La sensibilité révolutionnaire. *Paris*: Boivin, 1936. 300 pp Fr. 30

Tremblay, N J —E Scherer on the Franco-Prussian War, nine letters written anonymously to the N. Y. World. *Tucson*: Univ. of Arizona, 1936. 60 pp

Van Malssen, P. J. W —Louis XIV d'après les pamphlets répandus en Hollande *Amsterdam* H. J Paris (1936) xii + 226 pp. Fl 2 90.

Whitmarsh, W. F. H.—Lectures pour la jeunesse *New York*: Longmans, Green, 1936 192 pp \$1 00.

ITALIAN

Alfieri, Vittorio.—Bruto primo Con introduzione e commento a cura di C Pariset *Milano*: C Signorelli, 1935 87 pp. L. 3 (Scrittori italiani e stranieri, 30)

Baretti, Giuseppe.—Epistolario A cura di L Piccioni *Bar*: G Laterza e figli, 1936. 2 vols, 443, 387 pp L 70 (Scrittori d'Italia, 154-155.)

Bianchi, L.—Dante und Stefan George. Einführung in ein Problem *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1936 62 pp L. 6

Biondillo, F.—La critica di Francesco De Sanctis *Napoli*: A Morano, 1936 165 pp. L. 10

Boselli, A., e Masi, G.—I manoscritti petrarcheschi della 1 Biblioteca palatina di Parma. *Parma*: Tip Fresching, 1935. 24 pp. (Repr. fr "Archivio stor per le prov. parmensi," XXXIV)

Bosticca, G. B.—La Beatrice di "Vita nuova" non è che la fede oggettiva Vol I. *Pescia*: Tip G Franchi, 1935 106 pp.

Branca, V.—Il cantare trecentesco e il Boccaccio del Filostrato e del Teseida. *Firenze*: G C Sansoni, 1936 xi + 101 pp. L. 15 (Studi di lettere, storia e filosofia pubblicati dalla r. Scuola normale superiore di Pisa, IX)

Cagli, C.—G D. Romagnosi; 11 dicembre

1761-8 giugno 1835 La vita, i tempi, le opere. *Roma*: A. F. Formiggini, 1935. 381 pp L. 10

Calcaterra, C. — "Il nostro imminente risorgimento." Gli studi e la letteratura in Piemonte nel periodo della Sampaolina e della Filopatria. *Torino*: Soc. edit. Internazionale, 1935. xv + 651 pp L. 60 (Nuova biblioteca italiana, diretta da C. Calcaterra, I.)

Casanostra, Il. Strenna recanatese. Anno 86, n. 70 Celebrazioni dei grandi marchigiani, anno XII E. F. Leopardi, Rossini, Raffaello, Bramante Numero speciale pubblicato a cura del Comune. Recanati, 29 giugno 1935. *Recanati*. Tip. R. Simboli, 1935. 125 pp.

Ciccarelli, A. — Nel meriggio Antologia della letteratura religiosa moderna Fede, arte, vita *Lanciano*: G. Carabba, 1935. 699 pp. L. 15

Cisorio, L. — Profilo biografico di Daniele Gaetani, umanista cremonese (1465-1528) *Cremona*: Unione tip. cremonese di A. Bignami, 1935. 32 pp (Repr. fr. the "Bollettino storico cremonese," IV, f. III.)

Credali, A. — G. D. Romagnosi. Con dati e documenti inediti *Modena*. Guanda, 1935. 194 pp L. 10. (Collezione "Problemi d'oggi," diretta da U. Guandalini, n. 14.)

Crispolti, V. — Cesare Guasti L'uomo della pietà e della dottrina, artista cristiano della parola. *Torino*: "Lice," Lega it. catt. edit., R. Berruti e C., 1935. 351 pp. L. 9

D'Ancona, A., e Bacci, O. — Manuale della letteratura italiana Riordinato e annotato per licei da M. Sterzi. Vol. I 2a edizione accuratamente riveduta. *Firenze*: G. Barbèra, 1935. viii + 689 pp. L. 16

De Sanctis, Francesco. — La giovinezza Frammento autobiografico a cura di G. Ferretti. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1935. 316 pp. L. 12.

— Storia della letteratura italiana. A cura di N. Cortese. Vol. I. *Napoli*: A. Morano, 1936. xv + 483 pp. L. 10.

Equini, A. — Poeti e prosatori d'Italia. Antologia ad uso dei licei classici e scientifici. Vol. I: Dalle origini al Boiardo. *Bologna-Rocca S. Casciano*: L. Cappelli, 1935. 668 pp L. 18 (Biblioteca scolastica Cappelli.)

Fabbrovich, E. — Gli eroi nell'opera di Giosuè Carducci. *Udine*: A. Bosetti, 1936. 29 pp L. 3.

Fabiani, F. R. — Pensieri e canti per Franco Berardelli. *Cosenza*: D. Chiappetta, 1935. 48 pp. L. 4.

Falcone, P. — La poesia di S. Francesco. *Roma*: Edizioni Museo, 1935. 71 pp. L. 10.

Favatà, A. — La vita e le opere di Giovanni Verga. *Livorno*: R. Giusti, 1935. xi + 109

pp. L. 3. (Biblioteca degli studenti. I grandi italiani, 750-751.)

Flora, F. — La poesia ermetica *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1936. 196 pp. L. 12. (Biblioteca di cultura moderna, n. 285.)

Fogazzaro, Antonio. — Piccolo mondo antico. A cura, con introduzione e note di P. Nardi. *Milano-Verona*: A. Mondadori, 1935. xii + 387 pp. L. 10. (Edizione Mondadori per le scuole medie.)

Forcella, R. — D'Annunzio. 1886. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1936. 417 pp. L. 20. (Guida bibliografiche dell'Istituto nazionale fascista di cultura, n. 2.)

Gabriel, G. — Notizie statistiche, storiche, bibliografiche delle collezioni di manoscritti oggi conservati nelle biblioteche italiane. *Milano-Verona*: A. Mondadori, 1936. 227 pp. L. 16. (Enciclopedia del libro.)

Garavani, G. — I carmi latini di Alessandro Zappata. *Bologna-Rocca S. Casciano*: L. Cappelli, 1935. 12 pp (Repr. fr. the "Atti del III Congresso nazionale di studi romani.")

Gasperini, Lina. — Giuseppe Picciola e Giosuè Carducci *Trieste*: Tip. Mutilati, 1935. 39 pp. (Repr. fr. "La porta orientale," V [1935], fasc. 9-10.)

Grasselli, G. — Altri onorandi reggiani. *Reggio Emilia*: Tip. Caiti, 1935. 48 pp.

Guabello, M. — Barbara la bella romana. Il grande amore di Gabriele D'Annunzio. Prima notizia di un carteggio raccolto e commentato da —. *Biella*. Libreria M. Guabello, 1935. 24 pp L. 25.

Guicciardini, Francesco. — Scritti autobiografici e rari. A cura di R. Palmarocchi. *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1936. 415 pp. L. 30 (Scrittori d'Italia, 156.)

Leati, G. — Carducci e l'Umbria *Bologna-Rocca S. Casciano*: L. Cappelli, 1935. 75 pp. L. 5.

Leopardi, Giacomo. — Epistolario. Nuova edizione ampliata, con lettere dei corrispondenti e con note illustrative a cura di F. Moroncini. Volume III. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1936. 298 pp. L. 25.

Levi, A. — Romagnosi. *Roma*: A. F. Formiggini, 1935. 114 pp. L. 5 (Profili, n. 125.)

— Spigolature romagnosiane. Giandomenico Romagnosi al Collegio Alberoni *Parma*: Tip. Fresching, 1935. 57 pp. (Repr. fr. "Arch. per le prov. parmensi," XXXV.)

Levi, E. — Lope de Vega e l'Italia. Con prefazione di Luigi Pirandello. *Florenza*: G. C. Sansoni, 1935. x + 172 pp. L. 15 (Biblioteca hispano-italiana, IV.)

Lombardi Lotti, M. — Un dotto lucchese del Seicento. Bartolomeo Beverini. *Lucca*: Tip. A. M. Amadei, 1935. 55 pp.

Maorana, Fifi. — Strambotti in dialetto.

"Canzuni." Raccolti da —. *Trapani*: Tip. Radio, 1935. 18 pp. (Per le nozze Messina-Serraino.)

Manetti Barbieri, Lidia.—Il dramma interiore di Ermengarda *Firenze*: Ind. tip. fiorentina, 1935. 31 pp. L. 3.

Manzoni, Alessandro.—Antologia manzoniana. A cura di A. Pagano. Per uso degli istituti medi superiori. *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1935. viii + 266 pp. L. 8 (Nuova collezione di classici italiani con note ad uso delle scuole medie.)

— I Promessi Sposi. Commento critico di L. Russo. *Firenze*: "La nuova Italia," 1935. xx + 728 pp. L. 12. (Classici italiani.)

— Adelchi. Commento critico di L. Russo. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1935. iv + 137 pp. L. 7.

Metastasio, Pietro, 1698-1782. Saggi con commento estetico di C. Culcasi. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1935. 107 pp. L. 5.25 (Scrittori italiani con notizie storiche e analisi estetiche)

Mistici del Duecento e del Trecento. A cura di A. Levasti. *Milano-Roma*: Rizzoli e C., 1935. 1025 pp. (I classici Rizzoli diretti da Ugo Ojetti.)

Momigliano, A.—Storia della letteratura italiana. Vol. III. Dall'ottocento ai nostri giorni. *Messina*: G. Principato, 1935. 192 pp. L. 7.

Olivero, F.—The Representation of the Image in Dante. *Torino*: S. Lattes e C., 1936. 149 pp. L. 12.

Palmieri, E.—Giosuè Carducci. *Roma*. A. F. Formiggini, 1935. 103 pp. L. 5. (Profili, n. 124)

Parducci, A.—Il "Diario del viaggio di Spagna" di Francesco Spada. *Lucca*: Tip. Artigianelli, 1935. 52 pp. (Repr. fr. the "Bollettino storico lucchese," 1935, n. 2)

Parenti, M.—Prime edizioni italiane. Manuale di bibliografia pratica ad uso dei bibliofili e dei librai. *Roma*: F. Gerra, 1935. viii + 172 pp. L. 40.

Pedrazzi, A.—Iconografia tassoniiana. *Modena*: Soc. tip. modenese, 1935. 55 pp. L. 3.50.

Petrarca, Francesco.—Il canzoniere. *Firenze*: "Rinascimento del libro," 1935. 353 pp. L. 25.

Platen, August von.—Siracusa ad — nel primo centenario della morte; 1935, XIV — Benito Mussolini, Platen e l'Italia. *Siracusa*: Soc. tip. di Siracusa, 1935. 94 pp.

Rovani, Giuseppe.—Cento anni. Grande romanzo ciclico. Prefazione, note e commenti di B. Gutierrez. Vol. I, II. *Milano*: Rizzoli e C., 1935. 4to., 2 vols., 634, 699 pp. L. 50. (Collezione storica illustrata Rizzoli.)

Russo, L.—Alessandro D'Ancona e la scuola storica italiana. Discorso. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1936. 34 pp. L. 4.

Sanesi, I.—La Commedia. Vol. II. *Milano*: F. Vallardi, 1935. 769 pp.

Savonarola, Girolamo.—Prediche italiane ai Fiorentini. III, 2. Quaresimale del 1496 (Prediche XXIV-XLVIII) A cura di R. Palmarocchi. *Firenze*: "La nuova Italia," 1935. 591 pp. L. 40

Scivittaro, F.—Giosuè Carducci, poeta nazionale. *Spoletto*: Prem. tip. dell'Umbria, 1935. 32 pp. L. 3

Solmi, A.—Lo spirito italiano di Alessandro Tassoni. Discorso. *Modena*: Soc. tip. Modenese, 1935. 17 pp.

Storia del teatro italiano. A cura di S. D'Amico. Con introduzione di Luigi Pirandello. *Milano*: V. Bompiani, 1935. iii + 369 pp.

Trabalza, C.—Nazione e letteratura. Profil, saggi, discorsi. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1936. xxiv + 208 pp. L. 10. (Biblioteca Paravia "Storia e pensiero," n. 27)

Vicinelli, A.—La letteratura d'Italia. Per le scuole medie superiori. Storia e opere di autori. Vol. II. La letteratura del classicismo 1400-1750. Parte II Dalla tecnica del "Secolo d'oro" al barocco e all'Arcadia 1530c-1750c. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1935. xx + 703 pp. L. 15

Vico, G. B.—Antologia vichiana. Passi scelti dall'Autobiografia e dalla Scienza nuova a cura di A. Corsano. *Milano*. C. Signorelli, 1935. 152 pp. L. 6 (Classici della filosofia, n. 4.)

SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE

Castillo and Sparkman.—Sigamos leyendo. *Boston*: Heath, 1936. iv + 58 pp.

Catalogue de la Bibliothèque hispanique de M. R. Foulché-Delbosc. *Paris*: G. Andrieux, 154, Bd Malesherbes. 204 pp.

Farinelli, A.—Humboldt et l'Espagne. Goethe et l'Espagne. *Nouv. éd. Paris*: Alcan, 1936. 368 pp. Fr. 30

Larrieu, R.—Grammaire espagnole. *Paris*: Delagrave, 1936. 174 pp. Fr. 9

Muñoz Escamez, J.—La poésie espagnole, depuis la chanson de geste jusqu'à nos jours. *Paris*: Eds. de l'Écureil, 1936. 164 pp. Fr. 13

Palhano-Curci, F. de.—Nouvelle méthode pratique de portugais commercial. *Paris*: Jablonski, 1936. 206 pp. Fr. 12.

Thomasi et Denjean.—España. Textes espagnols expliqués. *Paris*: Delagrave, 1936. 368 pp. Fr. 20.

Van Dam, C. F. A.—Spaans Handwoordenboek. Tweede Deel. Nederlands-Spaans. *The Hague*: Van Goorzonens U. M., 1937. 1136 pp. Fl. 9.50.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LII

MARCH, 1937

Number 3

A SOURCE FOR PORTIONS OF *THE WITCH OF ATLAS*

On July 12, 1820, Shelley wrote to Peacock: "I have been reading with much pleasure the Greek romances. The best of them is the pastoral of Longus, but they are all very interesting and they could be delightful if they were less rhetorical and ornate." What echoes of this reading can be found in *The Witch of Atlas*? In Shelley's poem (LVII ff.) we find old Nilus, Egypt, Aethopia, and Axumé. And in *The Ethiopics, or Theagenes and Chariclea* of Heliodorus, we find that the scenes are laid in Memphis and Aethiopia; that chapter 27 of Book X has the name 'Αξιούμιτας the Axumé of *The Witch of Atlas*; and that this chapter also describes the cameleopard which Shelley mentions on only two occasions, i. e., in *The Witch of Atlas*, VI, and in the "Letter to Maria Gisborne," which, incidentally, was written immediately after his reading of the Greek romances.¹ It is easy to believe that Shelley's imagination was fired by the description of the beast and the names of the out-of-the-way places which he found in these stories, and we are not surprised to see them reappearing in the poetry written during this month.

There are other points of similarity to *The Witch of Atlas* in the romance of Achilles Tatius and in the *Daphnis and Chloe* of Longus. In Achilles Tatius, Book II, is the description of a fountain in Sicily "whose waters are mingled with fire: the flames are seen to leap up from underneath, yet if you touch the water, it will be found as cold as snow, so that neither is the fire extinguished by the water nor the water ignited by the flame, but a mutual truce exists between the elements."² These same qualities Shelley gives to the

¹ *Greek Romances*, ed Rowland Smith, Bohn Library, London, 1901, p 249.

² *Ibid.*, 382.

fountain in which the *Atlas* fairy lay, "a well of crimson fire," and yet composed of fire and snow, the materials from which she molded the image, Hermaphroditus. The charming innocence of the lovers in *Daphnis and Chloe* is reflected in that of the lovers in Shelley's poem: "Timid lovers who had been so coy They hardly knew whether they loved or not" (LXXVI).

But not all the Egyptian material in the poem can be accounted for in this manner. The Egyptian setting of *Theagenes and Chariclea* undoubtedly brought to Shelley recollections of Herodotus' *History*; and, I believe, we can find in this work another source of influence on *The Witch of Atlas*. In the *History*, Book II, chapters 145-150, we find the following account of Herodotus' travels in upper Egypt:

... they made the Labyrinth which lies a little above Lake Moeris, in the neighborhood of the place called the City of Crocodiles. . . The pyramids likewise surpass description . . but the Labyrinth surpasses the pyramids. It has twelve courts, all of them roofed with gates exactly opposite to one another, six looking to the north, and six to the south. . . There two different sorts of chambers throughout . . half underground, half above ground. . . I passed from the courts into the chambers and from the chambers into the colonnades, and from the colonnades into fresh houses, and again from these into courts unseen before . . . At the corner of the Labyrinth stands a pyramid, forty fathoms high, with large figures engraved on it; which is entered by a subterranean passage.³

Then he gives a detailed description of Lake Moeris and a subterranean passage from this lake which runs into the hills above Memphis.

Stanzas LVII-LX of *The Witch of Atlas* describe the "choice sport" of the Spirit, which was to journey down the Nile from Axumé, past pyramids, Moeris and the Mareotid Lakes, where naked boys play with tame water snakes and alligators; through the Great Labyrinth, she wandered, over the surface of the river where "shadows of the massy temples lie," through fanes and palace courts, through chambers high and deep, and on through the labyrinths, "mined With many a dark and subterranean street Under the Nile." It seems obvious that the Witch has passed through a land whose description is to be paralleled by that found in Herodotus. In both history and poem we find pyramids, Lake Moeris, the

³ Herodotus, *History*, ed. George Rawlinson, New York, 1885, II, 193-5. Cf. A. M. D. Hughes, "Shelley's *Witch of Atlas*," *M. L. R.* vii, 512.

Great Labyrinth, palace courts, and subterranean streets. Even the order in which these names occur is closely parallel, and such similarities seem too close to be ignored.

But the connections to be found between *The Witch of Atlas* and Herodotus do not cease with this reference. In Book II (from which the previous passage was quoted) Herodotus discusses the Egyptians' veneration for animals, particularly cats, dogs, hawks, shrewmice, and crocodiles. Here he describes the priests who told him about their mysteries, and mentions a lake on which the Egyptians at night represented the sufferings of Osiris, a representation which they called their mysteries. In this same book he also discusses the selection and sacrifice of the God Apis, and later in Book III, the story of Cambyses who declared Apis to be only a bull. Furthermore, in Book II, chapters 160-182, Herodotus gives in detail the history of the reign of Amasis in Memphis.

Again the parallels to *The Witch of Atlas* are unmistakable. The Osirian feasts on the Mareotid Lakes (LVIII),⁴ the gentle mockery of the priests (LXIV), the amused attitude of the poet toward their writings, their legends of Apis, and toward their veneration of animals (LXXIII) reflect the slightly skeptical tone of Herodotus as well as repeat the facts which the historian relates in Book II. Furthermore, Shelley concludes this passage with a reference to King Amasis (LXXV). Herodotus ends Book II with the history of this king.

Shelley was thoroughly acquainted with the historian. In 1812 he bought a translation of Herodotus, and his copy shows careful scrutiny.⁵ In 1815 he was reading *The History* while at Bishopsgate;⁶ and in the summer of 1818, he writes to Peacock (July 25, 1818) from Bagni de Lucca: "My custom is to undress and sit on the rocks reading Herodotus until the perspiration has subsided, and then to leap from the edge of the rock into the fountain—a practice in the hot weather exceedingly refreshing." One might easily believe that the reading of Herodotus was associated with many pleasant hours spent about Lucca, and that the return to this

⁴ Shelley here makes a natural mistake. These mysteries are held on Lake Sais; but Shelley was not versifying Herodotus.

⁵ Peck, W. E., *Shelley, His Life and His Work*, New York, 1927, II, Appendix F.

⁶ Dowden, *Life*, I, 536.

countryside in 1820 helped to recall his enjoyment of the Greek historian. The final record of Shelley's connection with Herodotus before the composition of *The Witch of Atlas* is in the letter to Peacock of September, 1819, in which the poet returns some volumes of Spenser and "the last two of Herodotus" to London.⁷ Did Shelley keep the first volumes with him in Italy? It is from the first two volumes that the parallels to *The Witch of Atlas* occur.

The appearance in Herodotus of the Garamantes which Shelley mentions in stanza XI, drew my attention to the discussion in Pliny's *Natural History* of "countries on the other side of Africa." Here appear the Garamantes and the Blemmyae who have no heads and have eyes in their breasts. With this as a clue, I found what I should like to offer as another possible source for stanza XI of *The Witch of Atlas*.

Pigmies, and Polyphemes, by many a name,
Centaur's, and Satyr's, and such shapes as haunt
Wet clefts,—and lumps neither alive nor dead,
Dog-headed, bosom-eyed, and bird-footed

Locock gives as a note on the epithet "bosom-eyed" the story of Shelley's horror at suddenly thinking while he looked at Mrs. Shelley "of a woman he had heard of who had eyes instead of nipples."⁸ Shelley's terror on reading *Christabel* is well known; and Medwin relates a similar vision of Shelley's experience at Byron's home. Medwin then adds "Proving that he had not forgotten the vision, in *The Witch of Atlas* he after made use of the epithet bosom-eyed."⁹ Although these stories may account for Shelley's use of this particular word, I do not believe that they account for its use in connection with the creatures that accompany the bosom-eyed in stanza XI.

The answer may be found in Pliny's *Natural History*, a book Shelley knew well. In chapter 2 of Book VI, Pliny writes that "on many of the mountains again, there is a tribe of men who have the

⁷ Ingpen, *Letters*, II, 720.

⁸ *Poems*, ed. C. D. Locock, London, 1911, I, 655. This story, told by Dr. Polidori and confirmed by Byron, is to be found in Rossetti's *Memoirs* and in the Buxton Forman edition of Shelley's works III, 248.

⁹ Medwin, T., *Revised Life of Shelley*, ed. Buxton Forman, London, 1913, p. 156.

heads of dogs . . . again there is a tribe who are without necks and have eyes in their shoulders." He then continues that in India at a certain place, the woman have feet so remarkably small that they are called Struthopodes, i. e., sparrow or ostrich footed (cf. Shelley's "bird-footed" in XI). In this same chapter he also mentions cyclopes, pygmies, and satyrs. Thus in one chapter on "the wonderful forms of different nations" are to be found, with the exception of the centaur, all the strange creatures enumerated in stanza XI of *The Witch of Atlas*, and moreover, Shelley mentions the dog-headed, bosom-eyed, and bird-footed ones in the same order in which they occur in Pliny.¹⁰

It is not unreasonable to believe that the material found in Pliny may have influenced Shelley as well as the stories mentioned by Locock and Medwin. Shelley was thoroughly acquainted with Pliny, in his youth he had attempted a partial translation of the *Natural History*. Undoubtedly the strange descriptions and stories had a powerful fascination for him, and it is quite likely that the hidden corners of his mind had long held images aroused by these accounts of the grotesque creatures in far-off lands. Does it not seem possible that when the Greek romances called up once more the pictures of Aethiopia and Herodotus' descriptions of that land, that Pliny's stories of these dog-headed, bosom-eyed, and bird-footed ones who also dwelt in Aethiopia should come back to the poet's mind? Perhaps the bosom-eyed Blemmyae of Heliodorus' *Ethiopics* recalled Pliny's descriptions of Shelley. The fact that these strange forms which are mentioned in stanza eleven of *The Witch of Atlas* occur in the same chapter of the seventh book of the *Natural History* would seem to indicate that in Shelley's mind they had been so linked together because he had found them thus united in his early reading in Pliny.

KATHRINE KOLLER

Bryn Mawr College

¹⁰ Pliny, *The Natural History*, ed. Boslock and Riley, Bohn Library, London, 1855, II, 122-31.

COLERIDGE AND SCHELLING'S TREATISE ON THE
SAMOTHRACIAN DEITIES

In the various discussions of S. T. Coleridge's obligations to Germany, no one has as yet considered his apparent borrowings from Schelling in his fragmentary lecture on Asiatic and Greek mythologies.¹ It is interesting to note that in this discussion some main points have evidently been taken from Schelling's lecture *Über die Gottheiten von Samothrake*.² The originality in Coleridge's presentation lies in a different treatment and viewpoint; nothing has been added materially to the etymological analysis of Schelling. This, of course, cannot change the general verdict that the German philosopher had far less material influence on Coleridge than was once assumed. Yet in this particular instance Coleridge did more than simply state his views in the words of Schelling.³

The objective of the German's study was to show that the Cabeiric mysteries were the first to add the belief in a future life to the religion of Greece.⁴ He considered his investigation a mere start for a more complete future research, the aim of which was to bring to light the *eigentliches Ursystem* of mankind. The Samothracian mysteries, he suggested, could almost be considered as if made to order to furnish the key to all other systems, since none of them would surpass it in age, in clarity, and simplicity.⁵

In taking over some of Schelling's essential ideas, Coleridge employs them for a different purpose. He wants to show as not altogether improbable that in the Samothracian or Cabeiric mysteries were concealed the link between the Asiatic and Greek popular schemes of mythology which he had discussed and contrasted in

¹ *The Literary Remains* (1836), I, 184-189. The lecture, which is printed partly from the notes taken by Mr. Green, dates back to 1818

² Published 1815 as *Beilage zu den Weltaltern*. Quoted here from *Schellings sämtliche Werke* (1861), Abt. 1, 8, 345-423

³ See A. C. Dunstan, *The German Influence on Coleridge, II, MLR.*, LVIII (April 1923), 201. Cf. also the first part of the article in LVII (July 1922). For further treatment and bibliography of German influence on Coleridge see Stokoe, *German Influence in the English Romantic Period* (1926), 89-143; 191-193; 196 ff.

⁴ Schelling, *op. cit.*, 348.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 423

the introductory remarks on the origin of polytheism. There are none of the metaphysical implications as found in the treatise of Schelling, although they were well known to Coleridge.⁶ He states that polytheism originated when man began to confound God with nature and found himself unable to see unity in the manifold and infinity in the individual.⁷ A most perfect instance of this kind of theism had been that of early Greece.⁸ In Asia, probably from the greater unity of the government and the still surviving influence of patriarchal tradition, the idea of the unity of God, so Coleridge contended, was a *distorted reflection*—Schelling uses the word *Verunstaltung*—of the Mosaic scheme, and was much more generally preserved.⁹ The uniform attribution of fixed moral qualities to the supernatural agents of eastern mythology particularly separated them from the divinities of old Greece.

In order to show the relationship of the Samothracian and Asiatic systems Coleridge discusses several "interesting facts" that seem to be taken from Schelling. There is first his interpretation of the term Caberri. It was to mean—"impliedly at least"—*socii* or *complices* that had a hypostatic or fundamental union with, or relation to one another, and who were "ultimately at least" divided into a higher and lower triad. These statements suggest the discussion of Schelling who in a long and painstaking analysis of the sources had endeavored to prove that the Etruscan deities—according to Varro called *consentes* and *complices*—would

⁶ In 1831-32 Schelling gratefully acknowledged this for a Non-German rare sympathetic attitude of Coleridge. See the twelfth lecture on the *Einleitung in die Philosophie der Mythologie*. *Ibid.*, Abt. 2, 1, 277 and 294.

⁷ Coleridge, *op. cit.*, 184 ff. Cf "Naturlich ist dem sinnigen Forscher die Neigung, alles Menschliche soviel möglich menschlich zu begreifen; natürlich auch, in der Erforschung der alten Gotterlehre ein Mittel zu suchen, wodurch die Vielheit göttlicher Naturen sich mit dem menschlich notwendigen und unaustilgbaren Gedanken der Einheit Gottes vereinigen liesse." Schelling, *op. cit.*, Abt. 1, 8, 358.

⁸ An important source of Coleridge on Grecian mythology were the lectures of C. G. Heyne, professor in Göttingen. See Dunstan, *MLR.*, xviii, 194 f.

⁹ Schelling refers to a comparison between the Samothracian ideas and those of the Old Testament and points out that here, perhaps, could be seen a confirmation of the theories of former investigators who saw in the pagan mythology only a "*Verunstaltung* der alttestamentlichen Geschichte und der an das Volk Gottes ergangenen Offenbarung" (Schelling, *ibid.*, 362)

these are the dual personality of Cadmilos or *Mercury*,¹⁴ on whose function as a mediator an especial emphasis was placed.¹⁵

Coleridge calls attention to the probable derivation of some portion of the Samothracian system from patriarchal tradition and to the connection of the Cabeiri with the Kabbala, a connection that was clearly pointed out by Schelling in an extensive philological discussion.¹⁶

In the concluding portion of the lecture dealing with Samothrace Coleridge mentions that its mysteries continued till some time after the commencement of the Christian era, a fact that is annotated by the editor of the *Literary Remains* by a reference to the *Annals* of Tacitus, likewise found in Schelling's notes.¹⁷ Perhaps it is also not without foundation to suggest that the mention of Paracelsus and Jacob Boehme by Coleridge in his concluding remarks was inspired by the mystical enthusiasm displayed by Schelling at the end of his lecture, in which he refers to the Cabeiri as links of those unbreakable magic chains so impressively symbolized by the indissoluble harmonic movements of the celestial bodies.¹⁸

WILLIAM K. PFELER

University of Nebraska

THE SOURCE OF WORDSWORTH'S "THE FORCE OF PRAYER"

On October 18, 1807, Dorothy wrote to Mrs. Marshall that on October 16 Wordsworth had begun to read Whitaker's *History of Craven*, apparently for the first time.¹ She then quotes an unre-

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 349, 360.

¹⁵ "Gesetzt aber, er diene zugleich den untern und den obern Gottern, so diene er jenen doch nur, sofern er der *Mittler* zwischen ihnen und den obern, also selbst höher war denn sie; und dieses gleichsam die leitende Verbindung zu sein zwischen den oberen und unteren Gottern, ist ja des Hermes eigentlichster Begriff. . . ." *Ibid.*, 357 f.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 367, and note 113, 415-420, especially 416.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, note 16, 374.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 368.

¹ Thomas Dunham Whitaker, *The History and Antiquities of the Deanery of Craven* (London, 1805). For the "Song at the Feast of Brougham Castle," written April-May, 1807, Wordsworth did not use the *History of*

vised version of "The Force of Prayer; or, the founding of Bolton Priory," and states that it had been composed about the middle of September. In this 1807 version the second stanza begins:

These words I bring from the banks of Wharf,
Dark words to front an ancient tale . . .

By 1815 when the poem was published these lines had been deleted and the first three stanzas reduced to two.

In October, while reading Whitaker for material for *The White Doe of Rylstone*, the poet came across a version of the story of young Romilly's tragic plunge into a chasm of the Wharf river,² which is the theme of "The Force of Prayer." In a note to *The White Doe*, line 226, Wordsworth refers the reader to Whitaker and to "The Force of Prayer" for a fuller explanation of the tradition. This is somewhat misleading, for the casual reader would infer that the *History of Craven* was the common source for the legend as it appears in both *The White Doe* and "The Force of Prayer." Knight adds to the confusion by printing "The Force of Prayer," which was written in September, after *The White Doe*, which was begun later in the year.³ The omission in 1815 of "These words I bring from the banks of Wharf, . . ." tends to obscure the real origin of "The Force of Prayer," which could not have been Whitaker, since Wordsworth evidently had not read his *History* until a month after composing the poem. In June, 1807, the Wordsworths and the Marshalls had been at Bolton, where the poet presumably heard the tradition from some Yorkshireman.

STEWART C. WILCOX

Baltimore

Craven; but later, in a note to *The White Doe*, line 268, says: "It gives me pleasure to add . . . further particulars concerning him, [Clifford, of "Brougham Castle"], from Dr. Whitaker." This looks as if he did not know Whitaker when he composed "Brougham Castle."

² Whitaker, *op. cit.*, 324.

³ *Poetical Works of William Wordsworth* (London, 1896), iv, 194-5.

LE MOT "TRADITIONALISME"

Il y a plusieurs acceptions du mot traditionalisme :

(a) Au sens le plus général, et le plus vague, il signifie "l'attachement aux traditions,"¹ quelles que soient celles-ci.

(b) En un sens particulier, il a d'abord servi à désigner la doctrine philosophique et religieuse suivant laquelle le principe de toute connaissance se trouve dans une Révélation primitive qui nous est transmise par des traditions dont l'Eglise est la principale dépositaire. On l'appelle aujourd'hui le traditionalisme doctrinal.

(c) Dans un sens moins spécial, quoique encore bien défini, le terme "traditionalisme" s'applique à l'ensemble des théories sociales, politiques, philosophiques et religieuses qui, au début du dix-neuvième siècle, favorisèrent le retour aux institutions de l'ancien régime.

(d) Enfin, on donne aujourd'hui le nom de traditionalisme au mouvement littéraire qui s'est développé vers la fin du siècle et dont les plus fameux représentants ont été Bourget, Barrès, Brunetière, Bazin, Bordeaux, Lasserre et Maurras.

Le traditionalisme doctrinal a fortement imprégné la pensée catholique du dix-neuvième siècle. Les plus illustres représentants en furent De Maistre, De Bonald et Lamennais,² les propagateurs Bautain et Bonnetty en France, le père Ventura en Italie et le professeur Ubaghs en Belgique. La doctrine eut des adversaires et le conflit entre "traditionalistes" et "rationalistes" fut très vif autour des années 1850. Rome intervint à plusieurs reprises. Il semble que le mot "traditionalisme" n'ait pas été employé avant le milieu du siècle. Certes, il y a danger de paraître trop affirmatif en pareille matière. Il est difficile de prouver qu'il ait été inventé pour désigner cette doctrine, mal aisé d'établir définitivement qu'il n'ait pas été employé avant une certaine date. Mais voici quelques remarques dont il est permis de tirer une conclusion :

D'abord, nous n'avons trouvé le mot dans aucun dictionnaire antérieur à 1860. Il ne se trouve pas non plus dans les œuvres où Lamennais a systématiquement appliqué les théories traditionalistes à l'ordre religieux, ni dans les principaux articles sur la question

¹ Définition donnée par tous les dictionnaires où se trouve le mot. Selon Hatzfeld et Darmesteter, "traditionalisme" serait un néologisme dérivé de "traditionnel."

² La doctrine prit d'abord le nom de "lamennaisianisme," Lamennais l'ayant méthodiquement exposée dans son *Essai sur l'indifférence en matière de religion* (4 vol., 1817-21), et dans la *Défense de l'Essai* (1 vol., 1820).

parus avant 1849 dans les diverses revues de l'époque.³ Il s'agit bien, dans toutes ces études, de la doctrine connue aujourd'hui sous le nom de "traditionalisme doctrinal." Les mots "tradition" et "traditionnel" y sont fréquemment employés — jamais les mots "traditionalisme" ou "traditionaliste." Par contre, en 1849, sous le titre *Les Rationalistes et les Traditionalistes*, paraissent dans le *Correspondant* plusieurs articles de l'abbé M. A. Chastel. On ne peut y voir "traditionalisme" mais "traditionalistes" s'y trouve presque à chaque page. En 1851, l'auteur revient sur le sujet et rappelle son étude de 1849 à ses lecteurs. C'est ici que "traditionalisme" semble faire sa première apparition :

Les uns repoussent en philosophie, toute autorité, même divine, dit-il; les autres méconnaissent ce que peut l'esprit humain, indépendamment de la révélation et de la tradition. C'est ce que nous avons appelé le rationalisme et le traditionalisme.⁴

En 1854, Albert de Broglie écrit une longue *Lettre au rédacteur du Correspondant* où il fait *Quelques observations sur la discussion des Rationalistes et des Traditionalistes*.⁵ En 1857, c'est-à-dire huit ans après les articles de l'abbé Chastel, Charles de Rémusat se sent obligé de définir le mot qu'il emploie dans le titre de son étude, *Du Traditionalisme: I. M. de Bonald et ses nouveaux adversaires dans le clergé. II. de Maistre*:

Ce dernier mot que nous n'avons pas créé, dit-il, et qui est passé dans la controverse contemporaine, pourrait servir à désigner en général tout l'ensemble d'idées et d'argumens qui, dans la philosophie, la politique, la religion, tend à exclure l'intervention libre de la raison.⁶

Il annonce que ce n'est pas dans Lamennais mais plutôt chez Bonald⁷ qu'il cherchera "ce qu'on appelle aujourd'hui le traditionalisme."⁸

³ Nous en avons lu un grand nombre mais le manque d'espace ne nous permet pas de les citer ici.

⁴ *Correspondant*, 25 juillet, 1851, p. 455. Bien que ces lignes suggèrent cela, l'abbé Chastel n'a point écrit "traditionalisme" dans ses articles de 1849. Nous les avons lus et relus (voir *Correspondant*, Vol. 24, pp. 29, 113, 309, 701) sans arriver à trouver le terme.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 25 novembre 1854, p. 161.

⁶ *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1er mai 1857, p. 47.

⁷ D'autres, l'abbé Chastel, Joseph Bricout, André Lalande, A. Cresson, etc. en trouvent la meilleure expression chez Lamennais. Presque tous nomment Bautain. Le vicomte Victor de Bonald proteste quand on parle du traditionalisme de Louis de Bonald, son père. Voir son article, *M. de Bonald et le Traditionalisme* (*Correspondant*, 25 novembre, 1854, p. 288).

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 47.

L'abbé Chastel paraît donc avoir été le premier à écrire le mot "traditionalistes" en 1849, et le mot "traditionalisme," en 1851. Que d'autres les aient employés avant c'est possible mais peu probable. En tout cas, on peut assurer que les termes n'ont pas été d'un usage courant avant le milieu du siècle. En 1858, parut à Liège un important ouvrage sur la question, *Le Traditionalisme et le rationalisme examinés au point de vue de la philosophie et la doctrine catholique*.⁹ Le sujet est longuement discuté dans l'*Encyclopédie Migne* en 1860 et 1864.¹⁰ "Traditionalisme" et "traditionaliste" se trouvent encore (au sens général et théologique) dans le *Grand Dictionnaire universel* (1865) de Pierre Larousse, dans le *Dictionnaire de la Langue française* (1873) de Littré, dans le *Dictionnaire général de la langue française* (1888) de Hatzfeld et Darmesteter et autres dictionnaires et encyclopédies modernes (non dans la *Grande Encyclopédie*).

L'application du mot "traditionalisme" au mouvement réactionnaire et conservateur du début du dix-neuvième siècle ne semble pas avoir été faite avant les premières années de notre siècle. Rien, tout au moins aucun des textes consultés, ne nous autorise à le penser. Auguste Comte et ses contemporains appelaient ce "traditionalisme" "l'Ecole rétrograde." La terminologie comtienne est employée dans un des articles mentionnés plus haut où l'auteur oppose les "rétrogrades" aux "progressifs."¹¹ En 1879, Frédéric Le Play parle de "l'esprit de tradition" et oppose les "hommes de tradition" aux "hommes de nouveauté." Ainsi font les rédacteurs de la *Réforme sociale*.¹²

La dernière acception du terme est de date assez récente. Elle n'est passée dans le langage de la critique que depuis une trentaine d'années, depuis que certains de nos meilleurs écrivains se sont

⁹ Par J. Lupus. C'est dans cette œuvre, parue sept ans après l'article de l'abbé Chastel, que le "Oxford Dictionary" trouve le premier emploi du mot traditionalisme. D'après le dictionnaire encore, la doctrine serait née vers les années 1840. Rappelons que les principes essentiels en avaient déjà été condamnés en 1832, 1834 et 1835. L'abbé Bautain et Bonnetty avaient signés des propositions où le Saint-Siège leur demandait de reconnaître l'autorité de la raison. La doctrine fut encore blâmée en 1851 et 1854.

¹⁰ *Encyclopédie Migne*, Vol. 57 (*Dict des droits de la Raison dans la Foi*, 1860), p. 747, et Vol. 50 (*Dict de la Philosophie*, 1864), pp. 902 et suiv.

¹¹ *Correspondant*, 9 décembre 1844, p. 602.

¹² Voir *Réforme sociale*, 1er février 1886, pp. 117-123.

donné à tâche de propager les doctrines de droite par le roman et le théâtre. Nous l'avons d'abord trouvée sous la plume d'Henri Bérenger, dans un article de 1897.¹³ Maurras l'emploie en 1900.¹⁴ Bourget s'en sert d'abord dans son roman *l'Etape* (écrit en 1901 et publié en 1902) dont l'un des principaux personnages, Ferrand, est "traditionaliste" en politique et en religion;¹⁵ ensuite, dans une lettre du 25 novembre 1903 où il explique comment il est devenu traditionaliste.¹⁶ A partir de cette date (1904) les termes traditionalisme et traditionaliste font partie de son vocabulaire courant. Ils reviennent constamment sous sa plume dans le livre que, en collaboration avec Michel Salomon, il a écrit sur De Bonald.¹⁷ Bourget applique à De Bonald sociologue l'épithète réservée jusque là à De Bonald théologien. Ainsi a dû s'opérer pour lui le passage de l'acception théologique à l'acception moderne, politique et sociale, du mot. Bourget a beaucoup étudié Bonald. Il le cite très souvent dans ses livres. Une partie du second volume des *Pages de critique et de doctrine* (1912) a pour titre, *Thèses traditionalistes*. Un chapitre de ce même livre (discours prononcé en 1904) est intitulé *La Renaissance du Traditionalisme politique*.

Chez Brunetière, nous n'avons pu trouver ni "traditionalisme" ni "traditionaliste." Maurras ne les a employés que très rarement. Nous les avons notés dans un article de 1900,¹⁸ dans un autre de 1905,¹⁹ dans l'*Action Française* du 21 octobre 1926.²⁰ On les trouve plus souvent chez Barrès: dans ses *Cahiers*, surtout ceux de 1902-1903²¹ et 1906-1907,²² dans les *Amitiés françaises*²³ et dans la préface de 1904 d'*Un Homme libre*.²⁴ Pierre Lasserre définit le traditionalisme dans sa préface de la nouvelle édition (1908) de son livre *Le Romantisme français*.

En 1907 parut à Bruxelles un livre d'Eugène Gilbert intitulé *Le Traditionalisme de Paul Bourget*. En 1908 ce fut *L'Idée traditionaliste dans le roman de Paul Bourget: L'Emigré*, par Guy de

¹³ De Chateaubriand à Barrès, *Revue Bleue*, 30 janvier 1897, p. 132.

¹⁴ Voir Barrès, *Scènes et doctrines du nationalisme*, I, 120.

¹⁵ *L'Etape*, p. 12.

¹⁶ *Revue des Revues*, 1er mars 1904, p. 21.

¹⁷ Paul Bourget et Michel Salomon—*Bonald*, 1904.

¹⁸ Voir ci-dessus. note 14.

¹⁹ *Quand les Français ne s'aimaient pas*, p. 192.

²⁰ *Dictionnaire politiq. et critiq.*, III, 160.

²¹ III, 61.

²² P. 15.

²³ V, 141, 248.

²⁴ P. ix.

Cassagnac. En 1909, Dominique Parodi publia, sous le titre *Traditionalisme et Démocratie*, une série d'articles antérieurement parus dans la *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*. Depuis lors, des critiques comme Albert Thibaudet, Victor Giraud et beaucoup d'autres ont souvent traité la question et employé le mot.

C'est donc entre 1905 et 1914 que "traditionalisme" et "traditionaliste," au sens politique et social, sont devenus d'un usage courant.²⁵ Mais cette acception ne se trouve encore que dans un seul dictionnaire, livre très spécial, le *Vocabulaire technique et critique de la philosophie* (1902-23), d'André Lalande. Encore la définition n'y est-elle donnée que du point de vue strictement philosophique. Par contre, "traditionalisme" et "traditionaliste" ont fait leur apparition dans quelques manuels d'histoire littéraire publiés depuis la guerre. Celui de René Lalou, *Histoire de la littérature française contemporaine* (1922) contient un chapitre intitulé *Traditionalisme et Internationalisme*. Enfin, on les retrouve en anglais dans le nouveau livre de M Régis Michaud, *Modern Thought and Literature in France* (1934).

University of Illinois

ALPHONSE V. ROCHE

²⁵ Cependant, quelques écrivains leur refusent le droit de cité. Après avoir parlé du "traditionalisme révolutionnaire de Maurras et de Bourget" (*Ann. Ecoutes de la France qui vient*, p. 204), Gaston Riou se reprend: "Dans le texte privé, dit-il, on lit *traditionnaliste*. M. Emile Faguet a forgé le mot plus simple de *traditionniste*. Nous l'adoptons" (*ibid.*, p. 206). En effet, Faguet emploie "traditionniste" dans la préface qu'il a écrite pour ce même livre. Il l'avait déjà employé dans un article sur les "Théories de M. Bourget" "Le fond de la pensée philosophique de M. Bourget est le traditionnisme (il écrit traditionalisme; mais ce mot a un sens théologique dans lequel il convient de le laisser, et d'autre part je ne vois pas l'utilité de dire en sept syllabes ce que l'on peut dire en six)" (*Revue des Revues*, 1912, xcvi, 476). Mais nous trouvons aussi traditionnisme dans *Le Petit Soldat de Plomb* d'Anatole France, lequel date de 1890: "La Tulipe, je vois avec plaisir que vous êtes traditionniste" (*Œuvres Complètes*, Ed. Calmann-Lévy, v, 447). Maurras l'emploie en 1896 (*Dict. politiq. et critiq.*, v, 334) et en 1900 (*Barbarie et Poésie*, p. 124). Ni "traditionnisme" ni "traditionniste" ne se trouvent dans les dictionnaires. M. Hubert-Gillot écrit "traditionnaliste" (avec deux "n") dans son livre, *Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes*, p. viii. Barrès aussi dans les *Amitiés françaises*, p. 15. Même orthographe chez Bourget (*Revue des Revues*, 1er mars, 1904, p. 21), chez l'abbé E. Julien qui l'emploie au sens théologique (*Correspondant*, 10 déc. 1896, p. 823), chez Girard et Moncel (*Pour et Contre le Romantisme*, p. 21), chez Henri Peyre (*Qu'est ce que le Classicisme?*, p. 179).

ON THE DATE OF THE *LANCELOT*

The date of the *Lancelot* is not known. In *Romania* LI (1925) 351 note, the late Jessie Weston detected an allusion in the German version, the *Lanzelet*, "which may prove to be of importance as an indication of date." In describing the riches of Lanzelet's court the author says,

8838 . . . und frumten ir gereite
mit spaecher richeite
von golde kostbaere,
als es die schiltaere
wol gemachen kunden
die man ze den stunden
8844 ze Ackers fand in der habe

"Was there," asks Miss Weston, "any special occasion when a notable haul of booty took place" at Acre? A reference to the Continuator of Guillaume de Tyr, xxvi, 1 f. and to Ambroise, *L'estoire de la guerre sainte* (ed. Paulin Paris, Doc. inéd. 1897), vv. 5063 f. will confirm her shrewd conjecture. For Acre was recaptured from Saladin by Richard I on July 13, 1191. Ambroise seems to have been a Norman jongleur attached to the train of Richard Coeur de Lion. This would seem to sustain the truth of the statement made by Ulrich van Zatzikhoven, the author of the *Lanzelet*, that his source was a French book brought into Germany by Richard I as partial security for the payment of the balance of the ransom which the Emperor Henry VI exacted for Richard's liberation.

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON

University of California,
Berkeley

A SATIRICAL PROCLAMATION

Some seventy years ago, Dr. F. J. Furnivall printed, in a medley of Middle English odds and ends,¹ a short but amusing piece which he entitled: Satirical Proclamation. Dr. Furnivall consulted various friends for their opinions on the Proclamation, and he himself

¹ *Political, Religious and Love Poems*, Early English Text Society, O. S. 15, London, 1866.

(p. xiv) inclined to the view expressed by Mr. G. E. Cokayne that "it is a satire by the party of Cardinal Beaufort on the pretensions of René Duke of Anjou, and titular King of Jerusalem, etc., whose daughter Margaret afterwards married Henry VI"; the probable date of the piece was set down as 1436 with a query.

Not long ago I came across another MS of this Proclamation and as there are a few small but (historically speaking) important variations in this version, I thought it might be of some interest to print the text as it stands in MS. Addit. 34193 (f. 203^b) of the British Museum:²

I, Baltizar, by the grace of Mahounde kyng of kynggs, lorde of lordis, Sowdayn of Surry, Empour of Babulon, Stiward of Hell, Porter of Paradise, Constabyll of Jerusalem, floure of alle this worlde and cussyn to the grettest God. / And 3e wylle witte why that I am kyng of kyngs, for I haue vndyr my protexcioun xxxviij^{te} crowne de kyngs And why that I am lorde of lordis, for I am Sowdayne of Babulone, for I wedded the Empours dowghter whyche was ayre to hyr fadyr And why I am Porter of Paradyse, ffor I am keper of the stremes and waterys wyche renne to Paradyse; wherfor ther may no man cum ther but vndyr my lycense And why that I am Stywarde of Helle, for I haue domynacion of Mawmentry and of wykked sprittis, and certyne clerkys within my reamys kan brynge Gahounde vnto me in what lykenes that I wylle desyre hym. And I am floure of þe worlde I may wylle say, for I haue in my keypyng that alle Cristyne people pray fore, that is to wytte the Holy Crosse that your Lorde dyed on, wyche may not be gotynn wthoutyne my lycense And why þat I am Coussyne to the grett God, ffor I whas a Crystyne mann borne and Englysusse borne And for that I vsed poyntis of Lollery I myghte not a-byde on Eynglonde, and from thense I went to Rome and from Rome to the Rodys; and ther I pervertyd vnto the Sareseyns. And that I whas a personabyll man, curteyse, lowly and gentylle, I whas put into the Sowdynse howse, and ther I whas husseher of the halle, and aftyr I whas Stewarde of hys landys. Thene dyed the Sowdayne and thus aftyr I wedded hys wyffe and thene dyed sche. And then I weddyd the Empours dowghter of Babulone and hys ayre, and thus I be-com Sowdayne of Surry. / And sende gretynge to [?your]³ kyng of Engeland and Fraunce, and Edward hys sone Pryns of Wallys. And yf he wille wedde my doghter, I wylle be-com a Crystyne man and alle my regeons & reames. And suche as wylle not convert wth me shalle be brent And I wylle gyffe wth my dowghter viij millions of golde and pay it within v Soundys.⁴ And I shalle delyuer hym þe Holy Crosse that your Lord dyed

² The MS flourishes have been expanded in every case, as in a large number of cases they actually stand for omitted letters; this, it appears to me, is better and more consistent than expanding the contractions only when a letter is needed and ignoring them otherwise.

³ MS. reads þō?

⁴ Compare Sand [NED, sb¹].

onn, and the spere wyche smote hym to the hartte, with many othyr Relykys that I haue in my kepyng. And I shalle make hym Empourrer of xviii kynggis, landys, etc.

There are four major points of difference between these two versions; the above text does not have the statement found in MS. *Vespasian B.* xvi to the effect that King Henry was "þe frenshe womman sone," nor the colophon reading "Writen in þe yere of youre gret god, my cosyn. MCCCCxvj yere." The Cotton MS., on the other hand, opens somewhat differently and the greeting to Edward "hys sone, Pryns of Wallys" is not found there.

For reasons that are not at all self-evident, Messrs. Gairdner and Cokayne believed that the date 1416 was incorrect; the former suggested that "'Henry kyng of England, þe frensh womman son,' can only mean Henry VI," while the latter argued that the definition "'þe frensh womman son' would not have been used after her (Catherine's) death in 1438." First of all, Henry V (1413-1422) was obviously as much the son of a French woman as Henry VI was. Secondly, it is not clear why "þe frensh womman son" could not have been used after Catherine's death. The Queen's conduct after the death of Henry V was certainly not above reproach, and the term "woman" seems hardly complimentary to a Queen. It is my impression that the term "þe frensh womman son" was deliberately aimed at Henry VI with rather less than a veiled reference to his mother's doubtful conduct. Catherine did, indeed, at least once excuse her conduct with Owen Tudor on the grounds that she was a French woman, if Miss Strickland's account is correct.⁵ If my conjecture is the right one, the term "þe frensh womman son" would have been a downright insult to Henry VI long after his mother's death.

Turning to the version printed above, the date of the Proclamation can be more closely determined. The *terminus a quo* is October 13th, 1453 (the date of the birth of Edward, Prince of Wales), and the *terminus ad quem* is March 4th, 1461 (the date of the accession of Edward IV). If any importance can be attached to the colophon of the Cotton MS., I should suggest that MCCCCxvj be read as MCCCClvj or, preferably, MCCCClxj. For this a number of pertinent reasons may be brought forward.

⁵ Agnes Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of England*, Philadelphia, 1903, vol. III, p. 153.

It is obvious that a Proclamation of this sort is a very ephemeral thing, and it is difficult to believe that anyone would re-edit such a Proclamation twenty or forty years after its initial appearance, for the satire would then, most probably, no longer have been apt. The two versions must, therefore, be nearly contemporary (and, of course, *post* 1453); the date in the colophon may be no more than a deliberate misdating by the scribe in order to protect himself from any possible censure.

Dr. Furnivall was at a loss to understand what the Proclamation was intended to satirize, but I should judge that it was mainly a satire on the sad state of affairs in England and on the Continent at that time. The fantastical story of "Baltazar's" life may be nothing more than a hint at Henry's insanity. The name may also have a hidden significance in connection with the Biblical story of Belshazzar's (Baltizar of Middle English texts) feast and the handwriting on the wall.

Another factor (and one on which I place considerable importance for the dating of this Proclamation) is the appearance, about the year 1460, of Pope Pius II's *Epistola ad Turcorum imperatorem Mahumetam*, in which he proposed that "the Sultan should embrace Christianity, and become, under the patronage of the Roman see, 'Emperor of the Greeks and the East.'"⁶ About the same time there also began to circulate a tract called *Epistolae magni Turci* purporting to be a series of letters written by Mahommed II ("Maumetes Turcorum Imperator") offering either threats or terms to the Pope, the governing bodies of Florence, Venice, Genoa, Brindisi, etc. The Proclamation may very well also have been intended to satirize these curious documents.

The date "early in 1461" appears to me to be easily the most satisfactory. Henry VI was still (theoretically at any rate) King of England and France (the latter by virtue of the "frensh woman") and not quite sound mentally; also Edward was still Prince of Wales. The oriental aspect of the Proclamation can very well be construed to be a satire on the letters of Pius II and Mahommed II, which had only just appeared. However it may be, the Satirical Proclamation is a very curious and interesting historical document.

CURT F. BÜHLER

Pierpont Morgan Library

⁶ *The Cambridge Modern History* (ed. 1907), vol. i, p. 78.

THE DATE OF SPENSER'S "VIEW"

Edmund Spenser's *View of the Present State of Ireland* can be dated 1596 on the evidence of several of its manuscripts, and in 1633 the first editor of the work, Sir James Ware, explains that it had been written "in the yeare 1596."¹ The credibility of this date is strengthened by Spenser's own location of his dialogue in England; for at the beginning Eudoxus refers to "that countrey of Ireland" whence Irenius has lately come, afterwards we hear of "this realme" of England, and the distinction becomes highly important in the final plea for an enlargement of the deputy's powers.² Given the directness of these allusions and the consistency with which *here* and *there* are used throughout, it requires little imagination to translate the recent arrival of Irenius into one of Spenser's English sojourns. It will be remembered that his last visit before that which ended in his death began late in 1595 or early in the following year, when the poet must have been in London to oversee the publication of the second installment of the *Faerie Queene*, and continued at least until September 1, 1596, when he dedicated the *Fowre Hymnes* from Greenwich.

The date 1596 has the further advantage of agreeing with probable allusions in the dialogue to Essex and his Cadiz Expedition of the summer of the same year.³ The weakness of such proof is that one hypothesis has been rested on another, or even that each is allowed to support the other.

But the *View* itself furnishes more definite criteria for determining its date, criteria full notice of which has not as yet been published. A reference to Lord Roche's bastards, for example, is included in several authoritative manuscripts of the dialogue:

¹ Bodleian MS Rawlinson B 478, first and last pages; Spenser's *Works*, ed. A. B. Grosart, London, 1882-4. ix, 256; the Scholartis Press edition of the *View*, ed. W. L. Renwick, London, 1934, p. 223; *The Historie of Ireland*, ed. Sir James Ware, Dublin, 1633, special title page for the *View*.

² *The Works of Edmund Spenser*, Globe Edition, ed. R. Morris, London, 1907, pp. 609, 651, and 682-3.

³ See William Cliff Martin, "The Date and Purpose of Spenser's *Veue*," *PMLA.*, XLVII (1932), 137-43. In an unpublished article, to which I am indebted for much that follows, Dr. Ray Heffner suggests that Martin's evidence might equally apply to the Island Voyage of 1597.

"Two such bastardes of the Lord Roches there are nowe out in Mounster whom he doth not onely countenance but also prively mayntayne and releive mightely against his tenauntes."⁴ And the depredations of these young men are confirmed by a passage in the Carew Papers which can be dated May, 1597.⁵ Five months later, on October 11, 1597, Sir Thomas Norreys reports to Burghley: "I verie latehe ap'hended and executed a base son of the Lo: Roches whoe for his aptenes to doe mischief helde a greate reputation amongst men of his quality by which these partes are much quited."⁶ The final portion of the *View* cannot, therefore, have been written long after October 11, 1597.

But we are justified in lowering this date by a reference Irenius makes to the expected death of the Earl of Clancare: a certain Donald MacCarthy who proclaims himself the bastard of that nobleman should be cut off, "for whensoever the Earle shall dye, all those landes after him are to come unto her Majestie."⁷ Now Clancare is known to have been ailing in October, 1595, and his death must actually have come towards the close of the next year since it is referred to in a letter written January 14, 1597.⁸ A date not long subsequent to this will be the latest acceptable for the end of the *View*.

At the same time allusions to Feagh MacHugh, the marauder of the Wicklow mountains, confirm the early part of 1597 as the upper limit of composition and suggest what may have been the lower limit. Spenser portrays Feagh as a living evil:

nowe he is become a daungerous enemy to deale withall . . . nowe all the partes about him being up in a madding moode, as the Moores in Lease, the Kevenaghs in the countye of Wexforde, and some of the Butlers in

⁴ Globe ed., p. 672.

⁵ *Calendar of the Carew Papers, 1589-1600*, p. 217; for pointing out this passage as well as indicating the editors' error in dating it April, 1597, I am indebted to the article of Dr. Heffner's already mentioned.

⁶ Dr. Heffner's transcript of the letter numbered cci. 10 in the *Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1596-1597*; see also *Carew Papers, 1589-1600*, p. 273.

⁷ Globe ed., p. 668.

⁸ *Journal of the Kilkenny and South-East of Ireland Archaeological Society*, VIII (1864-6), 387, 391, and 396; *State Papers, Ireland, 1592-1596*, clxxxiii. 90 and 1596-1597, cxcvii. 83; see also *Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland (The Four Masters)*, ed. John O'Donovan, Dublin, 1856, vi, 1993.

the countye of Kilkennye, they all flocke unto him, and drawe unto his countrey, as to a strong hold where they thinke to be safe from all that prosecute them.⁹

These words must have been written before or very soon after May 8, 1597, when the Irish chieftain was finally slain by the soldiers of Lord Deputy Russell.¹⁰ In the same passage, on the other hand, Irenius laments that Feagh has not been humbled, "as the honourable gentellman that nowe governeth there (I meane Sir William Russell) gave a notable attempte therunto, and had woorthely perfourmed it, yf his course had not bene crossed unhappely"; and here the reference is clearly to the Deputy's capture of Ballinecor, Feagh's stronghold, but not of Feagh himself, on January 16, 1595.¹¹

Can we be certain that the final portions of the *View* were written considerably later than January 16, 1595? If the central portion alludes to the Cadiz Expedition of midsummer, 1596, this seems probable. And Dr. Ray Heffner has brought forward specific evidence for such a view, citing another passage on Feagh, an explanation of the ill effect he has upon his Irish neighbors: "nowe lately, through the boldness and late good success of this Feugh Mac Hugh, they are soe farr emboldened, that they threaten perill even to Dublin, over whose necke they continually hange."¹² "The late good success of this Feugh Mac Hugh," Dr. Heffner points out, can only be his recapture of Ballinecor on or about September 10, 1596.¹³

This explanation is attractive since it allows us to date a large part of the *View* between September 10, 1596, and the beginning of 1597. It must, however, face certain criticisms. If Spenser does refer to the recapture of Ballinecor, he is writing not later than the immediate arrival of the news in England: then it must likewise be assumed that the continued ill effects of that action on the surrounding natives were known in England no less imme-

⁹ Globe ed., p. 660.

¹⁰ *State Papers, Ireland, 1596-1597*, cxcix. 28

¹¹ Globe ed., p. 660; *Oarew Papers, 1589-1600*, p. 225; see also William Camden's *Historie of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princesse Elizabeth*, trans. William Norton, London, 1630, pt. iv, 89, and *The Four Masters*, vi, 1597.

¹² Dr. Heffner's unpublished article, already mentioned; Globe ed., p. 660.

¹³ *State Papers, Ireland, 1596-1597*, cxci. 10 and 10. 1.

diately. Furthermore, the peril threatened to Dublin in the account of Irenius suggests not so much the recapture of Ballinecor as a raid made by Feagh's henchmen two weeks after Russell's fruitless capture of that place in January, 1595, a raid recent enough to be styled "late." *The Four Masters* describes it as follows.

Fifteen days after this, Walter Reagh and some of the sons of Fiagh, the son of Hugh, set out upon a nocturnal excursion (in sleeping time) to Crumghlunn, near the gate of Dublin. They burned and totally plundered that town [bally], and took away as much as they were able to carry of the leaden roof of the church of the town; and though the blaze and flames of the burning town were plainly visible in the streets of Dublin, Walter escaped without wound or bloodshed.¹⁴

This earlier alternative may materially weaken the case for the recapture of Ballinecor.

In any event, whether or not Spenser is writing after September tenth, other evidence makes it fairly certain that he is writing the final portions of the *View* in the second half of 1596 and that he completes the dialogue not later than the opening weeks of 1597.

Against this dating it would only be fair to notice a possible objection. After mentioning grants made by the Queen in the counties of Wicklow and Ferns, Irenius specifies: "as I thinke there is onely of New-castell to Sir Henry Harrington, and of the castell of Fearnese to Sir Thomas Masterson."¹⁵ The present tense might easily suggest that both gentlemen were still alive at the time of writing. In 1596 Harrington did in fact exist in the flesh, but Masterson's death had been reported to Burghley on August 15, 1590. There is no certain reference in the *State Papers* to show that he was alive after that date, although the index identifies as Sir Thomas a Masterson mentioned in a letter of 1595, when Richard Masterson was in possession of Ferns Castle.¹⁶

Is it therefore to be assumed, all other evidence to the contrary, that the *View* was written before August 15, 1590? It is surely more plausible to suppose that Spenser's present tense alludes to the grant, then held by the heir of Sir Thomas, rather than to the

¹⁴ *The Four Masters*, vi, 1597, the destruction of Crumlin is confirmed by the *Carew Papers, 1589-1600*, p. 226, and the *State Papers, Ireland, 1592-1596*, clxxx. 31.

¹⁵ Globe ed., p. 667.

¹⁶ *State Papers, Ireland, 1588-1592*, cliv. 7 and *1592-1596*, clxxviii. 43; *Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland*, xl (1910), 313.

grantee, or even that the poet was not aware Sir Thomas had died. Criteria both independent and dependable indicate that Spenser wrote the *View* between the opening of 1596 and that of 1597.

RUDOLF GOTTFRIED

The University of Wisconsin

NOTES ON THE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THOMAS CHURCHYARD

The modern student has two reliable sources from which to work up a bibliography of Thomas Churchyard—first, the account of his own writings furnished by Churchyard in his *Challenge* (1593); second, the list of extant printed works in the *Short Title Catalogue*. In addition to the works named in these two lists, however, a number of titles have been added to the Churchyard canon by various bibliographers, with the usual tendency of each writer to repeat the mistakes of his predecessors. Neither Adnitt nor Bullen,¹ the most recent bibliographers of Churchyard, has dealt critically with these attributions; with a few exceptions Adnitt based his bibliography upon Lowndes's *Bibliographer's Manual*, and Bullen seems to have followed Hazlitt's *Hand-book of Early English Literature*.

Two of these attributions are palpable errors. *The Fantasies of a Troubled Man's Head*, included among Churchyard's writings originally by Hazlitt and accepted without question by both Bullen and Adnitt, is identical with No. 180 in *Tottel's Miscellany*. It was reprinted, together with No. 177 in the *Miscellany*, as a broadside in 1566, and it is to this reprint that Hazlitt and the others allude. But in the broadside the *Fantasies* is explicitly signed "I. C." and the other poem "I. Canand." Canand, otherwise unknown, is unquestionably the writer of both poems, and has thus quite properly been identified as one of the "uncertain authors" in Tottel.² Bullen also seems to accept as Churchyard's the

¹ The first in his article on Churchyard in *Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological and Natural History Society*, III (1880), 1-68; the second in the article on Churchyard in the *DNB*. The bibliography supplied by Harold Child in volume III of the *CHEL* is incomplete even with respect to extant writings.

² See Rollins's edition of the *Miscellany*, 2 vols., 1929. II, 80.

"tragedy" of Mowbray in *A Mirror for Magistrates*. Signed "T. Ch." in the edition of 1559, this tragedy was accredited to Churchyard in the edition of 1593. Long ago, however, Haslewood³ demonstrated that "T. Ch" was intended to designate Thomas Chaloner; and more recently it has been argued with much cogency that William Baldwin was the actual author of this tragedy.⁴

Most bibliographers have also accepted without question several other works that are only doubtfully by Churchyard. *The Right Pleasant and Variable History of Fortunatus*, "printed by T. B. for Hannah Sawbridge," 1676, was tentatively claimed for Churchyard by Ritson⁵ on the basis of the signature "T. C.", and Lowndes, Hazlitt, and Adnitt all include it, repeating Ritson's groundless assertion, based apparently on the date of Dekker's play, that the work must have appeared originally before 1600 and was often reprinted.⁶ Since the earliest extant edition is dated almost three-quarters of a century after Churchyard's death, this work cannot be accepted as Churchyard's without considerable hesitation.

In a footnote, Ritson⁷ also attributed to Churchyard *A Paean Triumphall; upon the King's Publick entry from the Tower of London to Westminster*, "4°, 1603," and *A Blessed Balme to search and salve Sediton*, "4°, 1604"; all later writers include both titles without question. According to Ritson, they were "ascribed" to Churchyard in a catalogue of pamphlets in the Harleian library; he had not seen the books themselves. No copy of either work is known, and it is impossible therefore to judge the force of Ritson's use of the word "ascribe." Did he mean that Churchyard's name appeared on the title-pages, or that the cataloguer had conjectured Churchyard's authorship? Certainly the fact that he referred to these works tentatively in a footnote would

³ *A Mirrour for Magistrates*, ed. Haslewood (1815), II, 53.

⁴ W. F. Trench, *A Mirror for Magistrates: Its Origin and Influence* (1898), pp. 66-67.

⁵ *Bibliographia Poetica* (1802), p. 169.

⁶ A book called "The History of Fortunatus" (not Dekker's comedy) was entered by the printer Field, 23 June, 1615, and transferred by Field's widow to George Miller, 26 April, 1626 (Arber, *Transcript of the Stationers' Register*, III, 568, and IV, 157.) The first entry gives no hint that this was an old book.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 169.

indicate that Ritson himself was by no means certain concerning them. Lowndes says of *A Paean Triumphall* that it is a poem in heroic verse, printed in ten pages. It is just possible that this piece is identical with Drayton's well-known poem of the same title, a variant edition of which Lowndes may have seen.⁸ Concerning *A Blessed Balme*, Lowndes asserted that it was "a poem of six leaves, written in stanzas of seven lines, to the king, upon the plot for which the two priests Watson and Clark were executed," printed by Simon Stafford. Lowndes does not reveal the source of these particulars; they are sufficiently precise to prove the existence of the books, but unfortunately they are no more conclusive as to authorship than is Ritson's notice. These two titles, certainly, must be included among the works doubtfully attributable to Churchyard.

But although these works must be regarded as suspect, the present writer is able to "recover" for the old poet one poem of which no printed copy has survived. This is *The welcome home of the Earle of Essex*, a work with a curious history. Ritson and other early bibliographers record it as a companion-piece to Churchyard's *Fortunate Farewell to the Earl of Essex*, written upon the occasion of Essex's departure for Ireland in 1599, and assert that both works were reprinted in Nichols's *Progresses of Queen Elizabeth*. *The Fortunate Farewell* was so reprinted; *The Welcome Home* was not. *The Welcome Home* was entered in the *Stationers' Register* by William Wood, 1 Oct., 1599;⁹ and a recent writer has speculated that, as a result of the disfavor into which Essex fell shortly thereafter, the work was never printed.¹⁰ No one seems to have noted that the work was originally entered by E. Bolifant, 5 Oct., 1596,¹¹ or that a manuscript copy survives in Egerton MS. 2877, f. 16. The theme is not the return of Essex from

⁸ That Churchyard, however, did write verses on the accession of James I is attested by the following entry in the *S.R.*, under date 6 Feb., 1603 (1604): "Henrie Carre Entred for his copie a book of master Churchyardes Doinge beinge one book for the kinges maiestie One for the Quenes maiestie One for the prince And one for his maiesties honorable Household." Arber, III, 251.

⁹ Arber, III, 148.

¹⁰ G. B. Harrison, "Books and Readers, 1599-1603," *The Library*, Fourth Series, XIV, 3.

¹¹ Arber, III, 71.

Ireland, but the return of the expedition against Cadiz. It is perhaps fruitless to speculate why the poem should have been entered twice; but I would suggest that Bolifant, who had joined with Wood in publishing the *Fortunate Farewell*, saw an opportunity of putting Churchyard's poem to profit a second time, that for business reasons Wood made the second entry, and that because of Essex's disgrace the project was abandoned. The surviving MS. is a fair copy, made, I have no doubt, from a printed edition, probably a broadside, of about the year 1596. The full title is *The welcome home of the Earle of Essex and the Lord Admiral from the victorious voyage of Cales (i. e., Cadiz), 1596*. The colophon reads: "Written by Tho: Church-yard Esq, upon the Sodaine sight of y^e Earle of Essex coming to y^e Court." The poem itself consists of ten ten-line stanzas of fulsome praise.

ALLAN GRIFFITH CHESTER

University of Pennsylvania

GASCOIGNE AND THE OXFORD CIPHER

The years following the publication of B. M. Ward's arguments that George Gascoigne's *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* (1573) was in fact an anthology, to which the chief contributor was Edward de Vere, seventeenth Earl of Oxford,¹ have gradually seen disproved every piece of evidence or conjecture he has advanced,² with the major exception of the supposed cipher spelling Edward de Vere, which he found in the poem "The absent lover (in ciphers) deciphering his name, doth crave some speedie relief as followeth," with the first line, "*L'Escu d'amour*, the shield of perfect love." This cipher is, indeed, the very keystone of his theories, since it is the one tangible matter which can be produced of Oxford's con-

¹ B. M. Ward, *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* (Haslewood Books, 1926), pp. vii-xxxix; "Correspondence," *The Library*, VIII (1927), 123-127; "Further Research on *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*," *RES*, IV (1928), 35-48.

² See especially, W. W. Greg, "*A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*," *The Library*, VII (1926), 269-282; "Correspondence," *The Library*, VIII (1927), 127-130; R. B. McKerrow, "*A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*," *RES*, III (1927), 111-114; Genevieve Ambrose, "*A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*," *MLR*, XII (1927), 214-220; F. T. Bowers, "Notes on Gascoigne's *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* and *The Posies*," *Harvard Studies and Notes*, XVI (1934).

nection with the volume. It is perhaps past time, therefore, that this important and sole remaining link be logically examined.³

Ward's evidence is briefly as follows.⁴ He describes the simple acrostic type of poem, and on that analogy, "introducing a slight variation," he proposes to consider the first letter of every word in the poem instead of the first letter of every line. Such a string of letters can either be read, as normally, from left to right, or can be formed into a "swinging chain" whereby the first line is read from left to right, the second from right to left, and so on alternately. References to a description of ciphers in the *Novum Organum* give the reader the inference that such a method is described by Bacon. The way to solve the cipher is first to make a guess at the name of the person concealed, and then, commencing on some prominent letter in the first line, to discover whether this name can be picked out of the string of letters so that it finishes exactly on a letter in the last line and, moreover, can be read backwards through the poem, "beginning and ending on the same two letters." This reading back is presumed to remove the possibility of a fluke name being keyed into such a string of miscellaneous letters. Following the system of the swinging chain, the name Edward de Vere can be keyed into the poem. Ward thereupon bolsters his case by arguing that in *The Posies* all reference to a cipher in the title is omitted, and the keyword "Enæas" is changed to "Æneas" in order to make the cipher unreadable, since the first "e" in "Vere" comes on this word in the process of reading the name back through the poem.

Several matters can be brought forward to show the falsity of this cipher. In the first place, the reference to Bacon is entirely misleading. Bacon does not speak of ciphers in the *Novum Organum*, but in the *Advancement of Learning* he mentions them very casually, and in *De Augmentis Scientiarum* he describes one he invented.⁵ Nowhere does he speak of a cipher at all of the type given by Ward. This cipher, in truth, is not an Elizabethan one, but a system constructed entirely by Ward himself. And that

³ In his various articles W. W. Greg never challenged the cipher. R. B. McKerrow gave it considerable respect in his review. Genevieve Ambrose tried to break it down but did not succeed.

⁴ See *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, pp. xxvi-xxix.

⁵ J. M. Robertson, *The Philosophical Works of Francis Bacon* (1905), pp. 123, 527-529, 636-638.

it was invented for a purpose can readily be discovered by the proviso that the name must begin and end on the same two letters in the first and last line. In other words, no author whose name did not begin and end on the same letter could employ such a cipher, since the last letter of his name must be employed as the first letter of his first name in the reading back process. George Gascoigne could not have keyed his name into the poem according to Ward's system! With such a system, the cipher is tailor-made for Edward de Vere, but the curious rules remove any significance to such a performance with a string of letters. If we choose to modify these rules in a sensible manner, omitting only the necessity to begin and end on the same letter, the fictitious name "Elisabeth Howell" can readily be keyed into the poem, and I have no doubt there are many more names possible.⁶ Consequently, the efficacy of the cipher is destroyed.

Ward's suspicions that Gascoigne, in order to destroy the cipher, deliberately changed in *The Posies* the spelling of the keyword "Enæas" to "Æneas" are too readily aroused. The real truth is that "Eneas" is simply the older English spelling of the word which the printer of *The Posies* modernized.⁷ The spelling of "Æneas" was not a settled procedure. Spenser in his introduction to *The Faerie Queene* (1590) has the spelling *Æneas*, and Surrey

⁶ Genevieve Ambrose ("A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres," *MLR.*, xxii [1927], 216) asserts that she has keyed the following names into the poem according to Ward's method: George Gascoigne, Elisabeth Gascoigne, Thomas Churchyard, Genevieve Ambrose. No one of these names, however, can be used according to Ward's rule about beginning and ending on the same letter. Indeed, even according to my suggested modification of that restriction, none of these names will fit. George Gascoigne and Genevieve Ambrose can be discarded immediately, since there is no "g" as the first letter of any word in the first or last lines. Neither will Elisabeth Gascoigne do, for on the downward journey the final "ne" of Gascoigne would be transposed, and on the upward journey every "g" has been passed by the time Elisabeth is spelled. Thomas Churchyard, finally, fails because there is no letter "t" in the last line on which to start reading the name back through the string of letters.

⁷ By "modernized" I mean merely that the printer adopted the Latin digraph which in later years had become the correct spelling in English. The printer of *The Posies* consistently modernized the spelling of the *Flowres*. I give examples from the poem under discussion: 3. fayth] faith; 4. hyde] bide; 5. of] off; 14. Enæas] Æneas, 19. dye] die; 21. fayth] faith; 32. sone] soone; 33. servauntes] servants.

in his translation published in 1557, *Ænaeis*. Chaucer, however, has the spelling *Eneas* in the fourth line of *The Legend of Dido*, Caxton's Virgil of 1490 the title *Eneydos*, and Gavin Douglas the title *Eneados* in 1553. A change which will show the "modernization" of the word comes handily in two editions of Phaer's Virgil, which in 1558 has the title *Eneidos* and in 1583 *Æneidos*. Stanyhurst in 1582 uses *Æneis* and Harrington in 1591, *Æneas*. These citations show the familiar fact that the spelling of *Æneas* with an "E" was the earliest usage and that in later years the printers reverted to the Latin digraph. There seems, then, to be no reason why the change in the spelling from the *Flowres* to *The Posies* was not a perfectly natural one in harmony with the practice of the printer of the latter volume, and devoid of all ulterior motive.

To speak harshly, the discovery of the Oxford cipher in the poem was premeditated, according to a set of rules evolved to fit the name of Edward de Vere and no other. A sensible modification of these rules permits other names to be keyed in to the cipher. There is no cause to believe that the cipher was maliciously destroyed as the result of a conspiracy. Consequently, there is no reason to believe that a cipher of the type evolved by Ward was constructed in the poem by its author, or to believe that the Earl of Oxford was in any manner concerned with *A Hundredth Sundrie Flowres*. Whatever cipher or significance Gascoigne concealed in the verses is probably to be sought in their first line, "*L'Escü d'amour*, the shield of perfect love."

FREDSON THAYER BOWERS

Princeton University

ANOTHER VERSION OF "THE THINGES THAT CAUSE A QUIET LYFE"

Although William Baldwin's *A treatise of Morall Philosophie* (1547/8) is primarily a collection of short lives of twenty-four ancient philosophers and over twelve hundred of their wise sayings, gathered in appropriate chapters, one will find at the end of the Third Book a collection of fifty "Pythie meters of dyvers matters." Some of the rather crude couplets and quatrains in this collection were composed by Baldwin; others are the work of earlier

poets and writers. All of these poetic maxims were attributed to various ancient philosophers and poets.¹

The last poem of this collection, much longer than the others, is "The thinges that cause a quiet lyfe," the well known translation of Martial, x. 47, made by Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey.² This translation, as Professor Hyder Rollins has already pointed out, was apparently one of the first of Surrey's poems to be published.³ As Baldwin's *Treatise* first appeared on January 20, 1547/8, the poem was printed nearly on the first anniversary of its author's death, January 21, 1547.

The Baldwin text of the poem, however, differs in several respects—though not radically—from the lines printed in *Tottel's Miscellany* in 1557, and from the version Padelford prints from a Harington Ms. (Add. 36529):⁴

The thinges that cause a quiet lyfe
wrytten by Marciall.
My frende, the thynges that do attayne
The happy lyfe, be these I fynde.
The rychesse left, not got with payne.
The fruytful grounde, the quiet mynde.
The equall frende, no grudge, no stryfe.
No charge or rule, nor gouernaunce.
Without disease the healthye lyfe.
The householde of continuance.
The meane dyet, no daynty fare.
Wysdome ioyned with simplenes.
The nyght discharged of all care.
Where wyne the wyt maye not oppresse.
The faythfull wyfe without debate
Suche sleepes as maye beguyle the nyght.
Content thy selfe wyth thyne estate.
Neyther wysh death, nor feare hys might.

¹ Baldwin uses, for example, a quatrain he found in Ascham's *Twowophilus*:

"Euripedes, Englyshed by Ascham
What thing a man in tender age hath most i ure,
That same to deith always to kepe he shalbe sure
Therefore in age who greatly lōges good frute to mow,
In youth he must hym selfe good seed to sowe."

² Not until the 1556 edition of the *Treatise* did Baldwin credit Surrey with the translation: "and Englyshed by Lord Henry, Earl of Surrey."

³ H E Rollins, *Tottel's Miscellany* (1929), II, 150.

⁴ Rollins, *op. cit.*, I, 26, and F. M. Padelford, "The Manuscript Poems of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey," *Anglia*, XXIX, 25.

Variants in Add 36529: 1 Marshall the thinges for to attayne . . . 5 . . . nor stryf 7 . . . helthfull life 9 . . . delicate fare 10 . . . simplicitye 12 where wyne may beare no soveranty. 13 the chast wife wyse . . . 15 contented with thyne owne estate.

Variants in *Tottel's Miscellany*: Title, The meanes to attain happy life 1 Martiall, the thinges . . . 5 The egall frend . . . 7 . . . healthfull lyfe. 9 . . . delicate fare. 10 Trew wisdom, . . . 15 Contented with thine owne estate. 16 Ne wish for death, ne feare . . .

Baldwin no doubt saw one of the manuscript versions of Surrey's translation. Yet the fact that his version begins with "My frende"⁵ instead of the usual "Martial" suggests the possibility that Baldwin knew Surrey well enough to receive a manuscript of the poem from the author. This possible relationship is strengthened when it is known that Baldwin's first publication, as far as we know, was a sonnet written in the English or Shakespearean form, a sonnet form which Surrey is usually credited with introducing into England. Finally, the lines of Baldwin's sonnet, like those of Surrey's sonnets, are decasyllabic, although most of the lines in Baldwin's have only four regular stresses.⁶

TRUMAN W. CAMP

Texas Technological College

⁵ Professor Rollins (*op. cit.*, II, 150) reports a copy in MS Cotton Titus A xxiv, fol. 80, which begins "My frende."

⁶ Baldwin's sonnet is found on the verso of the title-page of Christopher Langton's *A very brefe treatise, declaring the principal partes of phisick* (1547). As I have never seen these lines reprinted in full before, and as they may represent the first sonnet published in English, I shall print them here:

"Wylm Baldwin·

Who so desyreth health got, to preserve:
And lost, to procure: ought chefully to knowe
Suche naturall thynges, as therto maye serve:
Great knowlege wherof, this boke wil him show.
Whiche smal though it seme contayneth as much
Of arte to be knowen of them that are wyse,
As byg myghty bokes agostfull to tuche,
As well for the wayght, as for the heavy pryce.
Reade it therefore all ye that love your healthe,
Learne here in an houre, elles where in a yere
Scarce red, the which Langton willing our welth
Hath englyshed brefe, as it doth appere.
To whom the free geuer of your so great gayne,
Yelde thakes & prayses, a payment for his payne.
Consule valetudini."

SANGLEY, THE MERCHANT-TRAVELLER

In the 1625 edition of *Hakluytus Posthumus or Purchas His Pilgrimes*, Samuel Purchas inserted an English translation of two letters from the *Conquista de las Islas Molucas* (1609) of Bartolomé Leonardo de Argensola (1562-1631). The letters were exchanged, either in Chinese, or Spanish, or probably in both languages, between the Chinese governor of Kwangtung and the Spanish governor of the Philippines, regarding the impress, revolt and massacre of Chinese merchants in Luzon. For the first time, the word *Sangley* and its plural forms *Sangleys* and *Sangleyes* appeared in the English language.¹ A complete translation of the *Conquista* into English was published in 1708, when this word appeared again, both alone and in the combination "Chineses or Sangleyes."²

A search for the word in the English dictionaries indicates that no attention has been paid to the word by any English or American lexicographers. The events narrated by the "Historiographer of Aragon" centred around the massacred Chinese on the one hand, and the Europeans, Japanese, and natives on the other. As *Sangleys* was used to denote the Chinese in the islands, as a substitute for Chinese when used alone and an alternative for it when used together, and as it was certainly not used to indicate any other national, it evidently was another name by which the Chinese were known abroad.

The origin of the term is not difficult to discover. *Shang Lü* (商旅), meaning "merchant-traveller," is one of the most commonly used expressions in Chinese. Ever since the time of Confucius, when the *Book of Changes* discussed the day of rest when all doors were closed, and merchant travellers did not go about their business (*Shang Lü Pu Hsing* 商旅不行),³ to the twentieth century, when Chinese business men petition for special privileges or measures of protection to safeguard merchants and travellers (*Ee An Shang Lu* 以安商旅), the term has been extensively employed. Chinese

¹ Samuel Purchas, *Hakluytus Posthumus or Purchas His Pilgrimes*, Glasgow, 1905-1907, XII, 218.

² Bartolomé Leonardo de Argensola, *The Discovery and Conquest of the Molucco and Philippine Islands*, London, 1708, p. 133.

³ Cited by Hu Shih, in his *History of Chinese Philosophy*, Shanghai, 1932, p. 85.

merchants in Luzon most probably called themselves *Shang Lai*. And if they did, there was no reason why their Spanish contemporaries should not call them by the same name.

This suggestion is partly confirmed by Spanish lexicographers. The *Diccionario de la Lengua Castellana* published by the Royal Spanish Academy in 1726-1739 did not list *Sangley*. It found its way into later editions, and is to be found in the 12th edition (1884).⁴ Zerolo and others also included the word. But it is interesting to note the fact that in most cases, the definition is only partly correct. *Sangley*, as an adjective or noun, indicates an "Indio chino que pasa a comerciar a Filipinas."⁴ W. E. Retana correctly says in his *Diccionario de Filipinismos*, that the name "in ancient times was given in the Philippines to Chinese merchants and then it became generic of those of this race resident in those islands,"⁵ and that it came "del chino xiang-lay."⁶ But his explanation of the Chinese term as equivalent to "mercader," is, of course, incomplete, *Xiang* or *Shang* (商) is merchant or mercader; *lay* or *Lu* (旅) is traveller or travellers. Retana cited several authorities; only one of these gave a satisfactory explanation. Buzeta y Bravo says in his *Diccionario* that *Sangleyes* means "comerciantes viajeros,"⁷ travelling merchants or merchant travellers. Unfortunately neither Retana, nor the other lexicographers followed him. They invariably neglected the traveller by omitting *viajeros*.

Y. Z. CHANG

University of Michigan

CHAPMAN'S FORTUNE WITH WINGED HANDS

In Chapman's *Bussy d'Ambois* one of the characters says to the hero:

The old Seythians
Painted blind Fortune's powerful hands with wings
To show her gifts come swift and suddenly,
Which if her favorite be not swift to take,
He loses them forever (I, i, 113-7).

⁴ P. 956.

⁵ W. E. Retana, *Diccionario de Filipinismos*, in *Revue Hispanique* (51) 1921, pp. 159-160. The translation is by Professor R. S. Boggs, to whom I am indebted for the Spanish references.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ Buzeta y Bravo, *Diccionario*, t. II, pág. 244, cited by Retana.

The detail of "hands with wings" is an unusual one; Professor Parrott says in his note on the passage: "I have not been able to trace any reference to such a representation of Fortune."

An explanation is to be found in Cartari's *Le Imagini dei Dei degli Antichi*, a work that went through a number of editions. I quote from the French version published at Lyon in 1581:

Les Scythes monstroient quasi le semblable, en l'image de leur Fortune: car comme Quint Curce recite, ils la faisoient bien sans pieds, mais ils luy mettoient des ailes entour les mains, desquelles elle donne & presente les biens, mais d'une si grande legereté, qu'à peine un autre a tendu la main, pour les prendre, qu'elle s'en est desia volée. D'avantage, combien que la Fortune aucunesfois se iointe à nous, elle ne permet neantmoins que nous luy touchions les ailes, pource qu'elle veut revoler, & s'en aller à son plaisir & s'en revolle, sans beaucoup tarder, car elle ne se peut arrester, & les felicitez qui viennent d'icelle ne durent gueres (p. 557).

Accompanying the text is a picture of Fortune without even legs, not to mention feet, and with wings along the lower sides of the arms and extending from the body beyond the tips of the fingers. The text and illustrations are in agreement with those of the Italian editions of 1608 and 1625.

The passage in Quintus Curtius is as follows:

Proinde fortunam tuam pressis manibus tene. Lubrica est, nec invita teneri potest. Salubre consilium sequens, quam praesens tempus, ostendit melius. impone felicitati tuae fraenos; facilius illam reges. Nostri [Scythae] sine pedibus dicunt esse fortunam, quae manus et pennas tantum habet; cum manus porrigit, pennas quoque comprehendere non sinit (VII. 8 24, 25).

Curtius says merely that Fortune had both wings and hands, but not that the hands themselves were winged. Fortune "sine pedibus" is not infrequently encountered; for example Jean Cousin in his *Livre de Fortune*¹ represents her legs as ending at the knees; her arms and wings, however, are independent, as is usual in pictures of winged human figures. His explanation is apparently from Quintus Curtius.

Other passages in his dramas make apparent Chapman's fa-

¹ The date of the original is 1568; edited by Ludovic Lalanne, Paris and London, 1883, plate 21. Similar descriptions are to be found in Alexandri ab Alexandro, *Dies Geniales* l. 13 (first edition in 1522), and in Giulio Cesare Capaccio, *Delle Imprese Trattato* (Napoli, 1592), 3. 16 verso. The latter attributes Fortune "pedibus mutilam" to Smyrna.

miliarity with the allegory of Fortune, so common in his day and so expressive of the belief of the age in the uncertainty of human life. In this description he substitutes Fortune's conventional blindness for the less usual detail of being without feet. Apparently depending on Cartari's description and picture, he did not realize that the united hands and wings were to be explained by a misunderstanding of the account in Quintus Curtius. The novelty seemed to him suitable to the effect he desired and valuable as lending something of variety to the conventional symbolic figure.

ALLAN H. GILBERT

Duke University

THE DATE OF *REVENGE FOR HONOUR*

On November 29, 1653, the publisher R. Marriot entered "The Paraside or Revenge for Honor by Henry Glapthorne" in the *Stationers' Register* as one of a list of seventeen plays. In 1654 an edition was published with the variant title-pages:

Revenge For Honour. A Tragedie, By George Chapman. London, Printed for Richard Marriot, in S. Dunstan's Church-yard, Fleetstreet.

Revenge For Honour. A Tragedie, By George Chapman. London, Printed in the Year 1654.¹

This edition is logically identified with the play registered in the 1653 entry, and the change in ascription of authorship between entry and title-page is customarily laid to the account of an unscrupulous printer endeavoring to capitalize on the name of Chapman, which had more drawing-power.² Conjecture has linked "The Paraside" of Marriot's entry (and thus the published *Revenge for Honour*) with the anonymous play, *The Parricide*, which was licensed by Herbert on May 27, 1624, for the Prince's men, then at the Red Bull.³ The general acceptance of this reasonable

¹ The setting for each copy is the same with the exception of the variant imprint.

² See especially, T. M. Parrott, *The Tragedies of George Chapman*, pp. 713-720, where the ascription to Chapman is vigorously and successfully controverted, and an attempt made to reaffirm the authorship of Glapthorne, or at least a revision by Glapthorne of an earlier play.

³ J. Q. Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, p. 28; F. G. Fleay, *A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama, 1559-1642*, II, 326.

identification has therefore up to the present led to the assignment of 1624 as the date of the production of *Revenge for Honour*, irrespective of the question of its authorship.⁴

I believe it possible, however, to establish a very strong inference for a production of *Revenge for Honour* in 1619/20. On December 31, 1619 (N. S. January 10, 1620), Girolamo Lando, Venetian Ambassador in England, wrote, among other matters, to the Doge and Senate:

In connection with the subject of comedians, I ought not to conceal the following event from your Serenity, owing to the mystery that it involves. The comedians of the prince, in the presence of the king his father, played a drama the other day, in which a king with his two sons has one of them put to death, simply upon suspicion that he wished to deprive him of his crown, and the other son actually did deprive him of it afterwards. This moved the king in an extraordinary manner, both inwardly and outwardly. In this country however the comedians have absolute liberty to say whatever they wish against any one soever, so the only demonstration against them will be the words spoken by the king.⁵

The play here mentioned has previously remained unidentified.⁶ I wish to point out the probability that it was *Revenge for Honour*, which of all extant Elizabethan tragedies conforms closest to the Ambassador's description.

In *Revenge for Honour* as we now have it, Abrahen, the ambitious younger son of the Caliph Almanzor, schemes to attain the throne by poisoning his father's mind against Abilqualit (the popular elder brother and the natural heir), and then leading a revolt of the enraged populace against the Caliph for the murder of Abilqualit. Abrahen succeeds in convincing the Caliph that Abilqualit is planning to overthrow him; but before the father can show any active resentment, Abrahen is enabled to hale Abilqualit before him on a false charge of rape, and the Caliph orders him executed on that charge as an example. Abrahen thereupon poisons his father and ascends the throne. There are two divergences be-

⁴ F. E. Schelling, *Elizabethan Drama 1558-1642*, II, 602. Parrott, p. 713, writes, "The entry in the Registers is so strong a link between the play licensed by Herbert and that published by Marriott that it would seem an excess of scepticism to deny the probability of their identity."

⁵ *Calendar of State Papers. Venetian (1619-1620)*, ed. A. B. Hinds, xvi, 111.

⁶ Mary S. Steele, *Plays & Masques at Court During the Reigns of Elizabeth, James and Charles*, p. 205.

tween the Ambassador's account and the plot of the play: (1) the execution of Abilqualit is not ordered "simply" because the father suspected his ambitious designs; (2) in the play Abilqualit, in a Fletcherian surprise scene, subsequently proves to be very much alive, owing to a surreptitious arrangement earlier made with his executioners. He succeeds in killing Abrahen but is in turn forcibly removed by the revenge of Caropia, his jealous mistress.

Both divergences can, I believe, be naturally explained. If *The Parricide* of 1624 be accepted as a version of the 1619/20 Christmas play, we have the very interesting question of the delay of four and a half years between its court performance and its licensing for the public stage. In this connection it is a reasonable theory that James's anger⁷ had a sobering effect on the actors and that they delayed producing the play again until some time had passed and, very likely, important alterations had been made.⁸ The original

⁷ The reasons for James's perturbation are not far to seek. The chief proponent of Divine Right could not view with equanimity a play in which a king was shown to be so faulty in judgment as was the Caliph in condemning an innocent son to death. Nor could James applaud a play in which a son murders his kingly father (who was neither a villain nor a tyrant) on the open stage. It is probably fantastic to believe that James, still smarting under the gossip that he had poisoned Prince Henry, read a parallel into the play, although some such notion may have lain unexpressed in the Ambassador's mind. Certainly he exaggerates some features. He speaks of the "mystery," and in a manner which suggests that the prince, simply because the actors were of his company, had something to do with the presentation of the play. He is unquestionably ill-informed in believing that little censorship of plays existed so that the actors had liberty to say anything about anybody. In fact, the words employed seem to indicate a belief in a personal content in the play which affected James rather than any affront to the theory of Divine Right, which must have been the true reason. Moreover, James's anger, though audibly expressed, could not have been so ostentatious as is recorded, else we should likely have heard some comment from John Chamberlain, who dismisses the festivities very casually. See Thomas Birch, *The Court and Times of James the First*, II, 196.

⁸ The prologue printed in *Revenge for Honour*, obviously that given on the popular stage, hints that the play was new. At the conclusion of this prologue the actor reminds the audience that they have applauded him in another sphere, and hopes that they will give him full measure now. This is usually taken as a reference to the removal of the Prince's company from the Curtain to the Red Bull, where *The Parricide* was acted. But since this event had taken place approximately a year earlier, such a reference could have little point. While the possibility remains that the actor of the

play may have been built somewhat on the order of Greville's *Alaham*, from which there are borrowings in *Revenge for Honour*; and the most obvious alterations would consist not alone in removing speeches inconsistent with James's rigid interpretation of the doctrine of Divine Right, but also in toning down the Caliph's jealous suspicions of Abilqualit's loyalty (too near to the gossip about Prince Henry's death) as the main motive for ordering his execution. To this end the story of Abilqualit's affair with Caropia (for whose rape Abilqualit is supposedly executed) would be emphasized more strongly; and perhaps the revision to avoid offence would even extend to the surprise resurrection of the elder son (thus removing some portion of the Caliph's practical guilt), and to the conclusion, borrowed from Fletcher's *Cupid's Revenge*, in which Abilqualit is finally slain by Caropia as the only possible means of completing the tragedy with the slaughter of all the principal persons. Indeed, the fact that such an original and sensational incident as the resurrection was boldly taken over, may indicate sheer necessity owing to an altered conclusion.

There remains, of course, always the possibility that the Ambassador saw no reason to attempt the description of all the involutions of the plot, which could only have proved confusing to the Doge. He has already been shown to have misrepresented, whether wilfully or through ignorance, the freedom of the English stage in dealing with personalities, which is the point he is stressing in the letter. Therefore, for fear of confusing the issue or of weakening his point, he may have omitted the matter of the actual grounds for the execution of Abilqualit and stressed the suspicions of the Caliph which had been strongly aroused by Abrahen. Finally, the resurrection of Abilqualit was beside the point and quite immaterial to his thesis, as well as being a confusing matter to recount, and it would very naturally be omitted. I believe that the divergences between the Ambassador's account and the plot of *Revenge for Honour* can thus be explained either as the result of prejudiced reporting or by reason of understandable revisions necessary before the play could be licensed.⁹

prologue had recently come from another company, there is also the very faint chance that it could refer to a previous court performance of the play. I do not wish to stress this interpretation, however.

⁹ Unless *Revenge for Honour*, or *The Parricide*, were in its first pro-

The identification of the 1619 Christmas play with *Revenge for Honour* through similarity of plot is further strengthened by the fact that it was the same company, the Prince's players, who produced the Christmas play at court in 1619 and to whom *The Paracide* (*Revenge for Honour* in 1624) was licensed for public performance four years later. Ownership of two plays with substantially the same plot by the one company makes the identification of the play given at court a few days before December 31, 1619/20, with *Revenge for Honour* a very reasonable conjecture.¹⁰

FREDSON THAYER BOWERS

Princeton University

SENECAN ELEMENTS IN MARSTON'S *ANTONIO AND MELLIDA*

Antonio and Melhida, 1601, is the most Senecan of Elizabethan plays.¹ It contains in its two parts eleven Latin quotations from Seneca. Three not previously noted are:

duction a play licensed and acted before its court performance in 1619 under another title which cannot now be traced, we have that rare occurrence of a play being given its *première* at court.

¹⁰ That Marriot in 1653 entered the play in good faith as by Glapthorne, may pass without comment, since there was no reason wilfully to change an ascription in favor of such a minor dramatist. Correspondingly, he must have possessed some factual evidence, such as a notation on the manuscript, for his original ascription in the *Stationers' Register*. But since *The Paracide* of 1624 antedates Glapthorne's period of dramatic activity by some years, as Parrott has pointed out (p. 719), the presentation of the play in 1619 further removes him from the position of the original author. If the resemblances (by no means thoroughgoing) to his acknowledged work (see Parrott, pp. 714, 718-726) be accepted in conjunction with Marriot's entry as affording proof of his connection with the play, it follows that Glapthorne must be considered merely as the reviser at some stage of its history, and very probably after the 1624 presentation.

¹ For Senecan quotations and parallels already noted, see John F. Cunliffe, *The Influence of Seneca on Elizabethan Tragedy*, pp. 100-05, 128; F. L. Lucas, *Seneca and Elizabethan Tragedy*, pp. 123-25; and A. H. Bullen's edition of the works of Marston, I, 1-191. H. Harvey Wood's new edition (London: Oliver and Boyd, 1934) notes one new Senecan quotation.

O me caelitum excelsissimum! ²

Heu, quo labor, quo vota ceciderunt mea! ³

Non servio Deo, sed assentio.⁴

Also, several Senecan parallels may be added to those already found, showing further the extent to which Marston was dependent upon Seneca in this play:

[A king is] fear'd,

Yet fear'd fears, and fears most to be loved ⁵

Qui sceptris duro saevus imperio regit,
timet timentes, metus in auctorem redit.⁶

'Tis more than he can utter, let him go:

Dumb solitary path best suiteth woe ⁷

Curae leves locuntur, ingentes stupent.⁸

Pish, true praise, the brow of common men doth ring,

False, only girts the temple of a king.⁹

Laus vera et humili saepe contingit viro,

non nisi potenti falsa ¹⁰

Pigmy cares

Can shelter under patience' shield; but giant griefs

Will burst all covert.¹¹

Levis est dolor qui capere consilium potest

et clepere sese, magna non latitant mala.¹²

Calamity gives a man a steady heart.¹³

Solent suprema facere securos mala ¹⁴

JOHN OLIN EIDSON

The University of Georgia

² Part One, I, i, 78. *Thyestes*, 911.

³ Part Two, II, ii, 158. *Octavia*, 632.

⁴ Part Two, IV, ii, 33. *De Providentia*, V, 6.

⁵ Part One, III, ii, 52-53. Cf. Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy*.

"As Fortune toileth in the affairs of kings,
That would be fear'd, yet fear to be beloved,
Sith fear or love to kings is flattery." (III, i, 8-11)

Marston possibly got his "and fears most to be loved" here; the idea is not Senecan.

⁶ *Oedipus*, 705-06. "Quod qui timetur, timet; nemo potuit terribilis esse secure" Ep. CV, 4. Cf. *De Clementia*, I, vii, 3, and xix, 5; *De Ira*, II, xi, 3-4; *Agamemnon*, 57-73; Ep. XIV, 10.

⁷ Part One, IV, i, 296-97.

⁸ *Hippolytus*, 607. "Nihil est enim difficilior quam magno dolori paria verba reperire." *Ad Polybium de Consolatione*, III, 3.

⁹ Part Two, II, i, 133-34.

¹² *Medea*, 155-56.

¹⁰ *Thyestes*, 211-12.

¹³ Part Two, V, ii, 143.

¹¹ Part Two, II, ii, 4-6.

¹⁴ *Oedipus*, 386. Cf. *Ad Helviam Matrem de Consolatione*, II, 3.

A MARSTON NOTE

H. Harvey Wood's new edition of the plays of Marston (London, 1934) leaves unidentified two Latin quotations from Virgil in *Antonio and Melinda* that no editors have yet noted:

S1 nequeo flectere superos, Acheronta movebo. (Dedication)
Aeneid, VII, 312.

Sic, sic juvat ire sub umbras. (v, i, 340)
Aeneid, IV, 660.

JOHN OLIN EIDSON

The University of Georgia

A MANUSCRIPT RESTORATION PROLOGUE FOR
VOLPONE

The importance of prologues and epilogues in criticizing the state of the theatres has long been recognized. During the Restoration, revivals of old plays were frequently accompanied by occasional prologues issued as broadside sheets, which are so scarce as to command high prices in the bookshops. Specimens of even greater rarity, preserved in contemporary manuscript commonplace-books, are valuable enough to deserve printing. Too recently for inclusion in my stage-history of Ben Jonson's plays¹ there has come to light an unpublished manuscript prologue for *Volpone; or, The Fox*, entitled "Prologue at the Fox, when a Consort of Hautboyes were added to the Musick."² Since there are extant a broadside "Prologue to the Reviv'd Alchemist"³ (ca. 1660) and one for *Epicoene; or, The Silent Woman*, as acted at the Cockpit at Whitehall on November 19, 1660,⁴ one is gratified to find that the other distinguished comedy in the famous triad was duly celebrated. The prologue follows:

¹ *Ben Jonson on the English Stage, 1660-1776*, Cambridge, Mass., 1935.

² Dobell's Antiquarian Bookstore, Tunbridge Wells, Catalogue 14, December, 1935, No. 228.

³ *Oxford Bibliographical Society, Proceedings and Papers*, Oxford, 1927, I, part IV, 281-282; *Ben Jonson on the English Stage*, pp. 105-106.

⁴ *Ben Jonson on the English Stage*, pp. 175-176.

Did Ben now live, how would he fret, and rage,
 To see the Musick-room outvye the stage?
 To see French Haut-boyes charm the listning Pitt
 More than the Raptures of his God-like wit!
 Yet 'tis too true that most who now are here,
 Come not to feast their Judgment, but their Ear.
 Musick, which was by Intervals design'd
 To ease the weary'd Actors voice and mind,
 You to the Play judiciously prefer,
 'Tis now the bus'ness of the Theatre.
 They Act, and if O're spent, for breath they stay,
 We serve but as the Chorus to their Play;
 In vain we chuse the best Poetick strain,
 The teeming head's choice labours cull in vain,
 Whilst plyant fingers quite putt down the brain. }
 The Fox above our boasting Play-bills shew,
 Variety of musick stands below.
 This fills the Pitt so full, and solid sense
 Is clear outweigh'd by empty circumstance.
 So to charm beasts Orpheus in vain did use
 The lofty Transports of his heav'nly Muse,
 Till waving those, all Fidler he appear'd,
 And Drew with Musick the unthinking Herd.

To attribute authorship for the prologue is impossible, but in spite of the lack of topical allusion in the verse one may guess at an approximate date in the second decade of the Restoration, when the charms of music were driving the companies into mad rivalry which led finally to the union of the King's company and the Duke of York's company in 1682. The only recorded performance of *Volpone* in the seventies was given on January 17, 1676, by the King's company at Drury Lane, for which the actors received £10,⁵ but the records both before and after this production argue for continuity in the performances of the comedy. Ben Jonson's ghost had arisen as early as 1671 to damn such follies of the stage as "wits low frippery" and "Farce, the trifling mode of France," with threats of scourging the vile poets of the day with scorpions,⁶ but the musical productions which lead me to date the prologue about 1675 did not begin until 1673 with Sir William Davenant's elaborate operatic version of *Macbeth* at Dorset Garden, "with all the Singing and Dancing in it: . . . it being all Excellently per-

⁵ Allardyce Nicoll, *A History of Restoration Drama*, Cambridge, 1923, p 308

⁶ Edward Howard, *The Womens Conquest*, sigs. C2-C4.

form'd, being in the nature of an Opera."⁷ The extravagance of *Macbeth* was burlesqued by Killigrew's company in November, 1673, in the epilogue of Thomas Duffett's *The Empress of Morocco*, itself a burlesque of Elkanah Settle's *The Empress of Morocco*, produced four months earlier at Dorset Garden. Pierre Perrin's opera *Aradne; or, The Marriage of Bacchus* followed at Drury Lane in March, 1674, and rivalry in music continued between the two patent houses the next month, when Thomas Shadwell's operatic version of Davenant and Dryden's *The Tempest* was performed at Dorset Garden. In November, 1674, Thomas Duffett again furnished Drury Lane with a burlesque of the rival piece at Davenant's house, entitled *The Mock-Tempest; or, The Enchanted Castle*; and when Shadwell's *Psyche* was brought out at Dorset Garden in February, 1675, Duffett once more exercised his wits in *Psyche Debauch'd*, produced in May by Killigrew's company. In the light of the overemphasis on song and spectacle from 1673 to 1675, it seems likely that the prologue for *Volpone*, deploring contemporary taste and the difficulties facing the classic repertory, may be safely dated at this time. It is not entirely unlikely that the prologue was delivered at the command performance on January 17, 1676.

ROBERT GALE NOYES

Harvard University

A NOTE ON *THE TEMPEST*

H. H. Furness, ed. *Tempest*, p. 82, compares Ariel's song,

Full fathom five thy father lies;
Of his bones are coral made;
These are pearls that were his eyes, etc.

with the passage in *Richard III*, I. iv. 26 describing the bottom of the sea with its "heaps of pearls." But no commentator, so far as I know, has ventured to think that the suggestion of Ariel's song may have come from another source than Shakespeare's imagination. I am convinced, however, that the notion of this marvellous and beautiful transmutation of human bones to coral and eyes to

⁷ John Downes, *Roscius Anglicanus* (1708), p. 33. See Montague Summers, *The Playhouse of Pepys*, London, 1935, p. 158.

pearls is of Celtic origin. For there is an interesting allusion to the tragic shipwreck of the *Blanche Neuf* in 1120, when Henry I of England's son and daughter were drowned, in Suger's *Vita Ludovici grossi* (ed. Molinier, Paris, 1886), c. xv, pp. 45-46, which, however crudely expressed, embodies this thought of Shakespeare in Ariel's song. For Suger, after having quoted Merlin's prophecy as found in Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Britonum* (ed. Giles, London, 1844, pp. 121-22), in regard to Henry I as the "Laon of justice," which concludes with the words *Catuli leonis in equoreos pisces transformabuntur*, makes the comment:

cum ex hoc etiam quod in fine de catulis ejus dicitur, manifeste appareat filios ejus et filiam naufragatos, et a maritimis piscibus devoratos et convertabiliter phisice transformatos, illius vaticinium pro certo verificasse.

Now Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Britonum* was printed at Paris in 1508 and again in 1517; at Heidelberg in 1587, and the *Prophetia Anglicana Merlini* in an English translation at London in 1529, besides which there was a French version in 1528, a Venetian edition in 1480 and a Florentine edition in 1495. Shakespeare could easily have had access to the *Prophecies of Merlin* (1529) and possibly to the Paris or Heidelberg edition of the *Historia Britonum*, and considering his familiarity with Holinshed, there is no reason to believe that he might not have been interested in some of Holinshed's sources, i. e. the works of Geoffrey of Monmouth. In short, it is my belief that Shakespeare found the immediate suggestion of the idea of "a sea-change" in one or the other of these works.

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON

University of California,
Berkeley

A SHAKESPEARE ALLUSION

I should like to call attention to a late seventeenth-century Shakespeare allusion that has hitherto been missed in biographies and bibliographies of the poet.¹ The passage occurs in *The great*

¹ I find no mention of it in *The Shakspeare allusion-book . . . re-edited, revised, and rearranged, with an introduction by John Munro* (1909), in John Munro's "More Shakspeare allusions," *MP.*, xiii (1915-6), 497-544, in G. Thorn-Drury's *Some seventeenth century allusions to Shakespeare and*

NOTES ON SOME EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY DRAMAS

As one of the many grateful users of Mr. Nicoll's valuable hand-lists of plays, I should like to supplement several items in the bibliographies of his two-volume *History of Eighteenth Century Drama*.

In the list of plays by unknown authors occurs the entry, " *T. Buthred (C. G. T 8/12/1778) MS Larpent 18 M. [2/12/1778]. [Ascribed to one Johnstone.]"¹ The asterisk "denotes that a copy of the play has not been seen by the compiler" (p. 231), while the entry itself shows no record of a printed edition. In volume 124 of the Longe Collection of Plays in the Rare Book Room of the Library of Congress one can find *Buthred, A Tragedy*, 8°, London, 1779.

In contrast to *Buthred*, the entry for John Logan's *Runnamede*, "8° 1784; MS. Larpent 36. M. [1784],"² indicates that the play was published in 1784 but never acted. Both facts are to be questioned. Although the *Biographia Dramatica* (III, 233) also gives the date of publication as 1784, the *DNB*. account of Logan, *The Lives of the Scottish Poets*,³ and the title page of *Runnamede* all give as the date of publication the year 1783. The tragedy, moreover, was not originally designed as closet drama but was accepted by a London manager for production. It was after the rehearsals of the play were stopped, on account of its supposed political allusions, that *Runnamede* was published. The tragedy was, however, played in Edinburgh, but whether before or after its publication the *DNB*. article on Logan does not explain. According to Anderson⁴ and *The Lives of the Scottish Poets*,⁵ *Runnamede* was performed in Edinburgh after its publication, but the life of Logan in Walsh's *British Poets* states, apropos of the banning of the tragedy, that "it was, however, acted on the Edinburgh boards, and afterwards published" (xxxvii, 242). If this statement means that *Runnamede* was acted in Edinburgh between the time it was banned in London in 1783 and the time it was published in

¹ *A History of Late Eighteenth Century Drama*, p. 321

² *Ibid.*, p. 282.

³ (London, 1822), III, Part vi, 54

⁴ *British Poets*, XI, 1028.

⁵ III, Part vi, 54

1783, it is probably less correct than that of Anderson and *The Lives of the Scottish Poets*.⁶

The Edinburgh production of *Vimonda* by Andrew McDonald (or MacDonald) is less frequently attested. According to Mr. Nicoll's entry, this tragedy was first played in the Little Theatre in the Haymarket on Wednesday, September 5, 1787.⁷ The statement of the *DNB*. article on McDonald that, previous to its acceptance by Colman, *Vimonda* "had been successfully played in Edinburgh, with a prologue by Henry Mackenzie" is partly corroborated by *The Lives of the Scottish Poets*, which tells how *Vimonda* was acted in the Scottish capital for the benefit of one of the players before it appeared in London.⁸

Two other plays had provincial performances not recorded by Mr. Nicoll. *Henry and Rosamond*, after its rejection by the managers of Drury Lane Theatre, was submitted in print by its angry author, William Hawkins, "to the Judgment of the Public" (Preface). Thomas Hull, in describing the debt of his own *Henry the Second; or, The Fall of Rosamond*, to William Shenstone, tells us that "in the Summer of that same Year [1761], Mr. Shenstone had been present at the Performance of a hasty Alteration of Mr. Hawkins's Tragedy of *Henry and Rosamond*, which I produced at the Theatre at Birmingham, for the temporary Use of a particular Friend."⁹ Mrs. Anne Yearsley's *Earl Goodwin* was performed not only in Bath in 1789,¹⁰ but in Bristol as well.¹¹ Incidentally,

⁶ The published version of *Runnamede*, moreover, does not give the names of the actors and actresses opposite the *dramatis personae* as is usual when the acting of the play preceded its publication. The date of 1784 on the Larpent MS. of the play is still unexplained. Mr. Nicoll says that most of the MSS in the Larpent Collection "have the dates on which (apparently) a license was granted" (*A History of Late Eighteenth Century Drama*, p. 231). From this it would seem that 1784 should be the date on which *Runnamede* was licensed for its London rehearsals, a date that is, however, incompatible with its publication in 1783. Moreover, Mr. R. B. Haselden, Curator of Manuscripts in the Henry E. Huntington Library, writes me that "in this manuscript there are no applications for a license or anything of that sort." In addition, most plays in the Larpent collection have the day of the month and not simply the year. Could 1784 represent the year when *Runnamede* was acted in Edinburgh?

⁷ *A History of Late Eighteenth Century Drama*, p. 283.

⁸ III, Part vi, 60-1.

⁹ Preface, *Henry the Second; or, The Fall of Rosamond*, p. i.

¹⁰ *A History of Late Eighteenth Century Drama*, p. 317.

¹¹ *DNB*., Article, "Ann Yearsley."

William Tasker's *Arviragus* was produced in Exeter but not c. 1795.¹² The first edition of this tragedy printed for the author in 1796 stated on the title page that it had never been performed. *The Gentleman's Magazine* for March, 1797 reprints a war song from *Arviragus* "as lately performed at the Exeter Theatre, by Desire of the Exeter Volunteers" (LXVII, 236).

Another play printed at Exeter, the anonymous tragedy recorded by Mr. Nicoll in *A History of Late Eighteenth Century Drama* (p. 332) as *Ivan* (8° 1785), probably should read *Ivar*. *Ivan* is not in The British Museum, but *Ivar* (8°, Exeter, 1785) is.¹³

There are, moreover, several plays not listed by Mr. Nicoll. One omission is the *Edgar and Elfrida* of Thomas Powell, whose pen name was T. de Monmouth. The play, privately printed in the 1790's, is accessible in the Library of Congress. Miss Stochholm, who called my attention to the former play, also mentions the *Elfrid* of Jackson.¹⁴ Her footnote reference sends one to *The Drama Recorded, or, Barker's Alphabetical List of Plays*, London, 1814. There, indeed, Jackson's *Elfrid* is mentioned, but so far I have not found her authority for identifying this Jackson with the John Jackson who wrote *Eldred* (another historical play) and *A History of the Scottish Stage*. The latter work, Genest, and the *Biographia Dramatica* make no reference to Jackson's *Elfrid*. Mr. Nicoll does not list Lonsdale's *Sketch of Alfred the Great or The Danish Invasion. A Grand Historical Ballet of Action, with Airs, Chorusses*, etc., performed at Sadler's Wells in 1798, though it is described by Dr. Miles¹⁵ and is accessible in The British Museum.

For Thomas Hull's *Henry the Second; or, The Fall of Rosamond* Mr. Nicoll lists one edition in 1773, three in 1774, but no more until 1795.¹⁶ There was, however, an edition printed in 1775—February 24, according to the title page. Comparison of the 1775 edition with those published in 1774 shows that the former is not merely composed of old sheets with a new title page.

In the text of *A History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama*

¹² *A History of Late Eighteenth Century Drama*, p. 310

¹³ See also *Critical Review*, LX (1785), 72-3 and *Biographia Dramatica*, II, 338.

¹⁴ Philip Massinger, *The Great Duke of Florence*, ed. Johanne M. Stochholm (Baltimore, 1933), p. lvi.

¹⁵ *King Alfred in Literature* (Baltimore, 1902), pp. 76-7

¹⁶ *A History of Late Eighteenth Century Drama*, p. 274.

(p. 76) occurs the statement that Rhesus, a character in Gildon's *Love's Victim*, "dies, not ranting, but with words of tenderness on his lips." As a matter of fact, ranting or not ranting, Rhesus does not die in the play.

FRANCES SCHOULER MILLER

New Jersey College for Women

AN INCONSISTENCY IN THE THOUGHT OF GOLDSMITH

The difference between Goldsmith the poet, governed by emotion and sentimentalism, and Goldsmith the critic, conditioned by neo-classic doctrine, is well shown in the inconsistency of thought in "The Deserted Village," 1770, and his "Essay on the Theatre," 1772. Professor Crane has pointed out that Goldsmith's essay, "The Revolution in Low Life," is a sketch of "The Deserted Village," antedating the finished poem by eight years and the passage on rural depopulation in "The Traveller" by more than two.¹ Thus, the poet was concerned "with the woes of the countryside" and their consequent bearings upon the Nation for some eight years before his final dealing with the theme in his famous poem.²

As warm-hearted poet, after eight years' pondering, Goldsmith wrote the familiar lines:

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay;
Princes and lords may flourish, or may fade;
A breath can make them, as a breath has made:
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroyed, can never be supplied.

Two years later, as dramatic critic, he wrote:

... as tragedy displays the calamities of the great, so comedy should excite our laughter by ridiculously exhibiting the follies of the lower part of mankind. . . . Nor is this rule without the strongest foundation in nature, as the distresses of the mean by no means affect us so strongly as the

¹ Ronald S. Crane, ed., *New Essays by Oliver Goldsmith* (Chicago, 1927), p. xl.

² *Ibid.*, xl.

calamities of the great. When tragedy exhibits to us some great man fallen from his height. and struggling with want and adversity, we feel his situation in the same manner as we suppose he himself must feel, and our pity is increased in proportion to the height from whence he fell. On the contrary, we do not so strongly sympathize with one born in humbler circumstances, and encountering accidental distress; so that while we melt for Belisarius, we scarce give halfpence to the beggar who accosts us in the street. The one has our pity, the other our contempt. Distress, therefore, is the proper object of tragedy, since the great excite our pity by their fall; but not equally so of comedy, since the actors employed in it are originally so mean, that they sink but little by their fall.*

The inconsistency is obvious. But after all, Goldsmith, castigator of sentimental comedy, failed to reconcile theory and practice in *The Good-Natured Man*, though he did succeed in *She Stoops to Conquer*.

IVAN L. SCHULZE

Texas State College for Women

GOTHIC NOTES

- (1) The Tmesis *-u-hwa-* in *ga-u-hwa-sehwi* = εἰ τι βλέπει Mark 8, 23.

The indefinite enclitic pronoun *hwa* was here involved in the tmesis in order to preserve the Grk. word order (*-u-hwa-* = εἰ τι). If the Grk. word order had been εἰ βλέπει τι, the Gothic would undoubtedly have read *ga-u-sehwi hwa* (cf. *habaiþ hwa* = ἔχα τι Math. 5, 23; *bigeti hwa* = εἰρήσεται τι Mk. 11, 13).

The reason why the tmesis *-u-hwa-* seems exceptional is because only here does the enclitic indefinite *hwa* occur in an indirect question (introduced by *-u-* in tmesis). Conditional *jabai hwa* = εἰ τι does not differ from *-u-hwa-* = εἰ τι except that the latter is restricted to indirect questions.

- (2) The Postpositive Position of the Indefinite Adjective *hwazuh* 'Each, Every.'

In its pronominal function *hwazuh* regularly precedes a partitive genitive, usually in accord with the Grk. word order¹ (cf. *hwazuh*

* "Essay on the Theatre," *European Theories of the Drama*, ed. Barrett H. Clark (Cincinnati, 1918), pp. 236-37.

¹ But compare *hweilo hwoh* = πάντας ὅσους (Cor. 15, 30). This word order survives in WGerm. (cf. OS *dago gihwilikes*, OHG *manno gilih*, etc.).

Streitberg (*Got. Elementarb.*²⁻⁶, § 283) has misread *hweilo hwoh* of this

gumakundaize = *πάν ἄρσεν* L. 2, 23, *hwok qinono* = *πᾶσα γυνή* Cor. 11, 5, etc.), but when used adjectivally *hwazuh* (= *κατά, πᾶς*) invariably follows its substantive and that too contrary to the Grk. word order (cf. *dag hwanoh* = *καθ' ἡμέραν* L. 9, 23, *jera hwammeh* = *κατ' ἔτος* L. 2, 41; *daga hwammeh* = *καθ' ἡμέραν* L. 16, 19; *winda hwammeh*² = *παντὶ ἀνέμῳ* Eph. 4, 14; *tvans hwanzuh*² = *ἀνὰ δύο* L. 10, 1).

The postpositive position of the adjective *hwazuh* must be due to its enclitic character as an indefinite (cf. Goth. *dag hwanoh* 'jeden Tag' with OS *dachwilek* 'taglich' where the enclitic is written together with its noun).

This assumption is supported by the parallel usage of the indefinite *sums* = *τις* 'some one, some, a certain.' In its adjectival usage *sums* regularly follows³ its noun in accord with the enclitic use of Grk. *τις* (cf. *wair sums* = *ἀνὴρ τις* L. 8, 27; *manna sums* = *ἀνθρωπὸς τις* L. 14, 16 etc. ad libitum).

The indefinite adjective *hwazuh*, on the other hand, translates Grk. *κατά, πᾶς* which regularly precedes the noun; hence the divergence between the Grk. and the Goth. word order.⁴

(3) Adverbial *pis-* in Indefinite Compounds.

Examples are: *pis-hwazuh* (*saei*) 'wer auch immer,' *pis-hwa* (*patei:pei*) 'was nur immer,' *pis-hwaduh* (*padei:pei*) 'wohin auch immer,' *pis-hwaruh* (*pei*) 'wo auch immer,' *pis-hun* 'meist, vorzüglich.'

In connection with a correlative particle adverbial *pis-* 'in this way' evidently has the same function as WGerm. *sō* (cf. OHG *sō wer sō* = Goth. *pis-hwazuh saei* 'such a one as'; cf. Goth. *swa-leiks*: OHG *solih* 'such').

Goth. *pis-hun* = *μόλιςτα*, which was not used with a correlative, may have signified 'any way' > 'surely, certainly.'

passage as *hweila hwok* and therefore construed *hwok* as used adjectivally instead of pronominally. His mistake was no doubt due to the postpositive position of *hwok*.

² These examples prove that the adjectival usage of *hwazuh* was not restricted to "Zeitangaben," as Streitberg (*ibid.*) infers (accepted by Braune, *Got. Gram.*¹⁰, § 164); cf. Jellinek, *Geschichte der got. Sprache*, § 150, Anm. 3.

³ In L. 15, 8 *aipþau suma qino, ði ris γυνή*, the translator has mistaken the interrogative *ris* for the indefinite *τις*.

⁴ But compare *ni . . . aiw hwanhun* = *πώποτε* 'at any time whatsoever' (J. 8, 33) with enclitic use of the adverb *hwanhun* = *ποτε*.

According to the current view Goth. *þis-* with indefinite compounds does not appear in the later North and West Germ. languages. Nevertheless, I believe we do have a survival of Goth. *þis-* in the OS hapax legomenon *ge-thes-wes* (gen. sing.) 'of some one or other,' *Ess. Glossen* (Luc. 22, 22).

Gallée (*As. Gram.*, § 373, h) assumes a nominative form *io-the-hwē* (sic, without asterisk).

Schluter (Dieter's *Laut- und Formenlehre der altgerm. Dialekte*, § 436, p. 715) postulates a nominative form **ie-thes-wē*.

That Schluter is right in assuming a nominative form with *-thes-* and not *-thē-* seems to me indisputable: (1) because a nominative form *-thē-* is impossible in view of its adverbial (indefinite) relation to the pronoun *-hwē* and (2) because an adverbial genitive *-thes-* could be used to supplement the indefinite force of *-hwē* and thus exactly correspond to Goth. *þis-* (cf. OS (*io-*) *thes-hwē* = Goth. *þis-hwaz* (-*uh*) 'some one or other').

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT

University of Kansas

AN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ESSAY ON SPELLING

An essay on spelling which is not included in A. G. Kennedy's *Bibliography of Writings on the English Language* (Cambridge and New Haven, 1927) is John LaFond's preface to his *New System of Music* (1725).

The author points out (pp. ii-iv) that habit has led us to the misuse of many words. As for spelling, LaFond advocates several changes. The most important are the dropping of the "k" in such words as "music," "physic," "mathematics," etc. (pp. v-vi), and the dropping of the "u" in "—our" endings (p. xii). Also, according to LaFond (p. vii), "foreigner" should be spelled without the "g," "author" without the "h" (p. vii). "Amiable" should be "aimable" (p. x).

In addition to changes in spelling LaFond suggests the use of different words in place of certain of those current in speech. For instance, "theorical" is to be preferred to "theoretical" (p. vi), and "improperty" to "impropriety" (p. x). He ridicules (p.

xii) the use of the word "consort" in speaking of musical functions, and proposes "concert" in its place. In discussing rhyme (p. xvii) he uses the words "prosical" and "versical," which he defends.

In reply to the critics who oppose the coining of new words LaFond answers (p. xiii) that ". . . Reason *and* Necessity, *not only both together, but either of them by it self, is more than authority.*"

He points out (p. xv) that although the English language has been enriched by foreign words it has gained in awkwardness and ambiguity. He is doubtful, too, whether the addition of new words as synonyms has been a gain (pp. xvi-xvii). LaFond wants to throw off the shackles of custom and let the language expand naturally (pp. xviii-xxi).

RICHARD C. BOYS

Baltimore

POCOSIN

Pocosin, poquosin . . . *Amer.* also . . . poc(e)oson . . . (Algonquin *poquosin*. . . . As the name of a river in Virginia, the word is found as early as 1635). In Southern U. S., A tract of low swampy ground, usually wooded; a marsh, a swamp. . . . (*NED.*)

The date of the first quotation given in *NED.* for the use of *pocosin* is 1709. In the Rent Rolls of Baltimore County (Md.) dated 1700,¹ this word appears several times as land tract boundary references. If, as is probable, the Rent Rolls quote verbatim from the original surveys, *pocosin* can be dated back still further. The land tracts under discussion were in the northernmost part of Maryland on the western shore, so that although the use of *pocosin* now seems to be confined to more southern states, at one time it was used as far north as the present Mason and Dixon Line. This is confirmed by Hodge² and Bartlett;³ Bartlett gives Eastern Maryland and Virginia as the range of this word, while Hodge

¹ "Maryland Rent Rolls," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, xix (1924), 347, 350.

² Frederick Webb Hodge, ed. *Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico* (Washington, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 30, 2 vols., 1907 and 1910).

³ John Russell Bartlett, *Dictionary of Americanisms* (Boston, 1877).

mentions North Carolina in addition. It is worth noting that Hodge² gives *poquosin* as the preferred spelling (listing *pocosin* among the variants) and derives it from the Renape⁴ *pákwesen*.⁵ This word is common to all Algonquian dialects. The following quotations from the Rent Rolls of 1700 are given with the dates of the original land tract surveys to which they refer:

- 1673 "... at the head of a little Creek Called Cathol Creeke at marked red oake nigh a *pocoson* . . ."
- 1678 "... in the woods at a bounded red oake by a *pocoson* of Coll. Wells his Land . . ."

J. LOUIS KUETHLE

The Johns Hopkins University Library

REVIEWS

Gotthold Ephraim Lessings Werke. Vollständige Ausgabe in 25 Teilen. Herausgegeben mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen, sowie einem Gesamtregister versehen von JULIUS PETERSEN und WALDEMAR V. OLSHAUSEN. Berlin: Deutsches Verlags-haus Bong & Co.

Begun in 1907 and completed in 1935, the *Lessing* in Bong's *Goldene Klassiker-Bibliothek* is, as the chief editor points out, the most ample of the annotated editions of this author. Though it does not embrace correspondence as such, letters to and from Lessing are copiously adduced in the Notes, and the more important of his translations and joint-products—likewise editorial publications, Lange's polemics, and Jacobi's account of the conversation concerning Spinoza—are conveniently included. Nor is this all. Supplementing twenty-five Parts of text and three volumes of Notes, there are two volumes of Indices, to wit: a "Sach- und Personenregister" and a "Wortregister"—here designated respectively SR, PR, and WR.

The scholarly world is aware of the pains taken to present an authoritative text—though opinions may differ as to the "middle

⁴ Lenápe or Delawares, formerly the most important of the Algonquian stock. (Hodge I, 385.)

⁵ *Pákwesen*, a verbal adjective meaning 'it (the land) is in a slightly watered condition.' (Hodge II, 287.)

course" pursued in some external matters, like orthography—and cannot but regret mechanical deficiencies here and there. My copy is supplied with *corrigenda* pertaining to VII, pp. 61, 81 and XII, p. 17. To these the following should be added:¹ v, 231, 8 for "von Molière, aufgeführt" read "darauf folgen liess. Wer"; [264] at the bottom the first words in each of the last three lines should be respectively "Regeln," "wegwirft," "völlig"; ix, 109, 14 for "des Antonius . . . Sibers" read "wenigstens so viel Schnitzer als Zeilen. Wir wollen sie"; xi, 200, 15 for "Ich . . . Ihr" read "Die mich alles verachten gelehrt hat, was Sie." Many errors are tacitly corrected in the Indices; not a few await correction; all that I have observed in a deliberate examination of the set of volumes shall be communicated to the publishers; I limit myself now to the consideration of certain editorial shortcomings.

Despite some unevenness of treatment in the several fields of Lessing's multifarious interests, and despite inevitable differences of judgment as to what should be annotated, and how, Introductions and Notes are prevailingly thorough and comprehensive. In the work, however, of a dozen editors—work spread over twenty-eight years and interrupted by deaths, war, and other calamities, it is not surprising that there should be found not only some inconsistencies, but also numerous mistakes and oversights. Names, titles, and citations seem to have contained the most frequent pitfalls.

A host of writers and a multitude of writings of all times and in a variety of languages go to make up the encyclopædic learning of Lessing. The editors have aimed to record both names and titles in authentic form, albeit with occasional abbreviations. There may be no serious objection to Germanized names for English kings. But where Addison is properly entered as Joseph and Wycherley as William it must be inadvertence that dubs Spence "Josef" and Warburton "Wilhelm," or Anderson "Jakob" and Ramsay "Andreas." Typographical conformity to foreign usage is still more unsteady. *Paradise lost* and *Essay on man*—not to speak of *Essai* xviii, 35, 39, [934] 28, [968] 28—have an un-English look; and why should *The Soldier's Fortune* [57] 11, [59] 20 be dignified with capitals, but not *The constant couple* [59] 17? "Arundelhouse" [830] 39 and "Wiltonhouse" [830] 40 are discredited by "Wilton House" [830] 36. French usage is even less consistently followed. A Frenchman would write "Jean de la Fontaine" i, 7, 5, but not "Œuvres de la Fontaine" [489] 6: the form "La Fontaine" occurs PR s. v. "Panard," but elsewhere, so far as I have noticed, only "Lafontaine," e. g. i, 8, 8, xv, 9, 28, PR, [60] 31. Similarly, the correct "Fénelon" appears once [424] 22—

¹ I refer to Part, page, and line. Numbers in square brackets stand for pages in the appropriate volumes of Notes; here the pagination is continuous.

elsewhere "Fénélon" [476] 25, PR etc. Since Lessing's spelling is throughout discreetly normalized, it would surely be well to supply standard accents in French, Italian, and Spanish. As to titles, with *Le médecin malgré lui* [85] 1 cf. *La Veuve à la Mode* [89] 44; with *L'Avare* [88] 21 cf. *L'avare* [208] 37 and *l'Irrésolu* [208] 28; *L'envieux, ou la Critique du Philosophe* [88] 16 is singularly lopsided. "Lieber gar keinen Titel angeführt," admonishes Lessing (VIII, 182), "als ihn so angeführt, dass man mehr dabei denken kann, als man soll."

In what follows it is doubtless the proof-reader who speaks; but he invites attention only to the more significant of his items.

PART I, p. xxix, 35 for "Hutchinsons" read "Hutchesons"; xxxiv, 30 for "Winckelmanns Kunstgeschichte" read "Winckelmanns Gedanken uber die Nachahmung"; xxxv, 32 for "Professieren" read "Professoren"; xlix, 8 for "Unbekannten" read "Ungenannten"; 3, 3 we read "Er ist ein Pferd" the same sentence begins xvi, 20 with "Es"; 3, 10 we find the story of the "Haufen Bucher," already told xiv, 8, [18] 8 for "ces" read "ses", 39, 31 for "gar zu viel" read "gar viel"; [49] 4 for "355 ff." read "294 ff" and for "386" read "326"—the higher numbers include sixty-one lines of "Vorerinnerung", [54] 43, [57] 31, [58] 22 with "Kyrupadie" cf. "Cyropadie" [253] 1, PR s. v. "Cyrus II"

PART II, p 170, 31 for "O'ai-je" read "Qu'ai-je"; [57] 9 for "Barnelms" read "Barn-Elms"; [57] 40 "Ottomanische Pforte"—Note inadequate; [60] 40 "Staaten-General"—in this order because of "États-Généraux": cf. "Generalstaaten" IX, 153, 39; [60] 44 for "réformé" read "réformé", [70] 16 "Defterdar"—more accurately explained in SR: presumably derived from διφθέρα, [71] 21 "risquer le paquet"; cf. IV, 511, 10; [71] 47 invert "mât schâh", [77] 58 for "ipse" read "ipso."

PART III, p 12, 41 "die Regel Boileaus" is too summarily stated. cf. *Art Poétique*, 230 f; 191, 25 for "Ihrem" read "ihrem", 230, 13 "Collin" is not clearly identical with the "Collins" of the PR, [82] 16 "Oronte"—combine with Note [91] 2, [85] 28 "sapientia sat. dem Verständigen genugt's" cf [91] 45 "dem Weisen genugt's", [86] 19 for "Je puis" read "Que je puis"; [103] 7 "diese geographischen Scherze" hardly need explanation, [104] 21 for "conselle" read "conseille"

PART IV, p 2 The editor, ignoring e. g. Wernicke (see PR), makes too broad a jump from Opitz to Bodmer and Gottsched; 3, 24 "Batteux, Du Bos"—invert; 10, 1 for "Skribenten" read "Dichter" (cf. VIII, 137, 13); 10, 32 for "doch häufiger" read "und fleissiger"; 13, 15 for "8." read "7"; 13, 24 for "und freyen" read "und der freyen"; 24, 13 "eine alte Klage" deserves a Note: *inter arma silent musae*, 57, 24 by "Johnson" Lessing means Ben Jonson, 158, 3 "correre alla pena" etc. might seem to deserve translation in a Note, though "la nuit porte avis" (117, 32) perhaps not, in this volume a dozen citations in Latin remain without comment; [113] 2 read "Essay of dramatic poesy" (cf. PR); [113] 13 for "Marlow" read "Marlowe"; [115] 27 for "quam" read "veterum tum quae"; [117] 1 read "Ancient English Poetry"; [121] 37 read "Gardiner"; [123] 2 read "Principes de la littérature ou cours de belles lettres"; 277, 29 for "John Harris (1709-1750)" read "James Harris (1709-1780)"; 278, 29 among the "Engländer" Edmund Burke deserves mention; 278, 38 "sich fast dafür entschuldigen"—hardly, he deliberately adopted a device of composition; 282, 32 "Der hier neu geprägte Begriff des 'poetischen Gemäldes'" was by no means now newly coined: to say

nothing of Bodmer, Lessing had operated with it six years before (cf. iv, 99 f.); 283, 7 ff. gives no clear exposition of the place of Chapter xvi in the economy of the treatise, viz. inductive preparation (i-xv), summary deduction from first principles (xvi), elucidation and application (xvii ff.); [130] English and American names are missing from the brief bibliography; [132] 3 "eingeführt," so in Germany; [133] 24 with "Deianeira" cf. "Deianira" ([137] 34), [137] 4 read "Confidante"; [142] 12 read "traduites", [145] 19 read "Epistles, Satires"; [146] 39 read "Concinnitas", [166] 21 read "mise"; [172] 3 read "codicis fragmenta."

PART V, p. 223, 45 correct "jusqu'au" to "jusques au"; 253, 19 for "misshandelte" read "mit handelte"; 255, 32-41—translate both footnotes, if either, [179] 30 for "Verwunderung" read "Bewunderung"; [186] 28 read "Gueullette"; [200] 15 for "Jonas" read "Jones"; [203] 44 read "ipso"; [223] 8 read "De l'art de la tragédie," Vorrede zu *Saul fureux*; [240] 28 for "M. L. N." read "M. L. R."; [249] 22 for "Dichtung" read "Richtung"; [254] 25 read "Remarques."

PART VI, p. 48, 42 Lessing presumably wrote "Templars-would-be" instead of the more natural "Would-be Templars" on the model of "Sir Politick Would-be" (cf. xvi, 257, 3); [300] 16 for "Jam Howel" read "James Howell"; [310] 25 read "Freemasons"; [311] 18 read "Brethren"

PART VIII, p. 35, 41 read "fühlen"; 70, 17 "Cyrus . . . Orondates" deserve a Note, [357] 11 read "imprimés"; [357] 19 for "revues et augmentées" read "corrigés et augmentés"; [365] 4 read "premiers"; [366] 32 read "fabularum"; [369] 25 read "Isaaci."

PART IX, p. 24, 37 read "éléments"; 58, 1 "Perrot"—it is not enough that PR s. v. "Perotti" refers to this passage; 103, 5 "Cicero," viz. *De Div* 2, 219 (cf. Varro, *Sat. Men., Eum.* vi [151]); 118, 3 since "Religion à l'homme essentielle" is of different purport than "la religion à l'homme essentielle" a Note as to the author would conveniently supplement the information given under "Religion" and "Marie Huber" in the Indices; 121, 1 f. Horace, *Sat.* i, 4, 43 f.; 158, 16 "Herr Fielding ein Schauspieler"—no corrective Note; 239, 8 read "thelematologischen"; 265, 25 "verordnet," namely by a statute conferring upon Jews the right to naturalization, 290, 7 cf. *Paradise Lost*, 26; 297, 20 cf. Horace, *Sat.* 2, 3, 38 f., 316, 30 "Boadicea"—such was the form in Glover's title: the "Letter" makes it "Boadicea" and does not call the tragedy "new"; 466, 37 for "born" read (like 468, 34) "borne"; [373] 29 read "Encheiridio"; [393] 34 for "Alr." read "Abraham", [394] 20 read (with xxiii, 235, 40) "Houyhnhms"; [398] 42 read "holà"; [409] 32 and elsewhere for "Smollet" read "Smollett"; [412] 8 for "Jan" read "Jean."

PART X, p. 32, 29 for "fut plus" read "fut-il plus"; 239, 32 in "blunt-fade" the hyphen is apparently a misprint for the sign of equality and "fade" should be in *Fraktur*; 239, 33 for "narrisch" read "Narr"; [424] 40 the reference is to *Relazioni degli stati ottomani*, [425] 2 ff. read "Soltani Solymanni . . . 1553 patratum"; [464] 42 for "Person" read "Parson"; [465] 2 for "to" read "so."

PART XI, p. 18, 28 read "Y a-t-il", 142, 18 for "sie" read "Sie"; 226, 10 for "Ihnen" read "ihnen"; 226, 11 for "Sie read "sie"; 237, 32 read "vorsichtig"; [471] 19 for "prêts" read "forêts."

PART XII, p. 27, 33 read "lives"; 165, 13, 21 (likewise xxiv, 121, 36 ff.) the use of "i" for the pronoun of the first person calls at least for comment; 167, 36 by "Spencers" Lessing means "Spenser's"; [487] 20 for "les beaux" read "les plus beaux"; [488] 2 read "Laureate"; [506] 12 after "Angloises" read "Scene"; [509] 22 put a period after "Joan"; [509] 39 for "Agustin" read "Agostino"; [511] 33 for "discovered" read "observed"; [511] 41 for "Vergil" Dryden wrote "Virgil"; [512]

6 for "gawning . . . observation" read "yawning . . . expectation"; [512] 37 for "waiting-woman . . . parts" read "waiting-women . . . parts"; [513] 25 read "inconsiderable"; [513] 26 read "speech"; [513] 44 put "ridiculum" in Italics; [515] 47 read "peut-être."

PART XIII, p. 22, 43 for "1796" read "1726", 29, 35 read "Letter", 31, 26 read "Observations"; 122, 3 for "de" read "des"; 128, 15 read "Cette"; 152, 15 "Ut pictura poesis erit" are the first words of Dufresnoy's *De arte graphica*—Horace's "erit" belongs (contra [537] 5 ff) to the following sentence; [527] 16 read "Guevara"; [528] 36 for "ac et" read "ac"; [530] 26 read "captifs"; [534] 44 for "eux" read "ceux"; [535] 48 read "traduit"; [543] 34 "conclideret" is Halm's reading. Du Bos has "concliderent," for which there is also authority; [548] 23 for "Jos." read "Josuae"

PART XIV, p. 10, 9 f., 32 f. are undesirably repetitious; 89, 5 for "mässiger" read "unmässiger", 95, 34 read "eine", 203, 40 a question mark after "diseases"; 203, 45 "too" in Roman.

PART XV, p. 9, 28 read "Alix", 11, 1 "Romanschreiber"—rather, journalist, pamphleteer, and translator; 11, 1 ff. read "L'Estranges' Fables of Aesop, and other eminent mythologists, with morals and reflexions" . . . 1692", 13, 24 read "Le Bossu", [640] 3 read "reproché", [642] 43—already cited, with the correct "ses" for "ces" [637] 40

PART XVI, p. [684] 25 se liber—cf. PR; [688] 16 read "Etymol."; [691] 19 for "meditorum" read "ineditorum"

PART XVII, pp. [708] 25, [712] 7 read "Traité historique"; [724] 38 for "postclass" and [734] 33 "post classical" read "post-classical"; [726] 7 read "compleat", [747] 48 read "Anthologie"; [759] 11 read "Shuckford."

PART XIX, p. 12, 18 read "saurer", 201, 5 "Mr. Write" is J. M. Wright; 212, 20 read "Grand-Duc", 288, 12 "notting" should be annotated as standing for "noddng", [806] 14 read "s'est . . . mémorable"; [807] 46 for "de" read "du", [808] 37 read "recueilles"; [813] 7 f. read "joaillier . . . pierreries"; [818] 17 for "of" read "to", [827] 7 read "prononcées"; [827] 14 read "Memoirs", [827] 16 read "retraite"; [833] 42 read "graver"; [838] 38 read "un", [842] 20 insert "ou tableaux", [845] 11 read "fatta"; [847] 14 for "de . . . native" read "du . . . natif"; [848] 32 read "Nicot"

PART XX, p. 16, 40 read "Rowe", [860] 31—cf. PR s. v. "Deslauriers"; [861] 44 read "Moses"; [863] 32 read "Laurence."

PART XXI, p. 38, 37 "au"—Lessing's error for "en"; 245, 9 read "Ubrigen."

PART XXII, p. [880] 14 read "Rationalisme", [882] 12 read "Messiae"; [882] 25 f. read "Mohammed . . . explanatory"; [882] 28 f. read "Humphrey . . . Mahomet"; [890] 42 read "Humphrey"; [891] 4 for "of the" read "on the."

PART XXIII, p. 254, 18 read "Ihrer"; [901] 47 for "imaginé" read "imaginaire."

PART XXIV, p. 105, 7 Pope oddly prints "e're" for "e'er" but not "deviats" (107, 28), and his "gole" (125, 28) for "goal" deserves a Note; [937] 45 read "Huber", [953] 40 for "nais" read "naiz," & e. "nés."

PART XXV, p. [1019] 11 for "nimium" read "nimirum"; [1073] 20 read "iroquoises"; [1074] 15 read "Smollett: Peregrine"; [1083] 13 read "sentiments"; [1085] 22 read "Reliques"; [1092] 13 read "A free discussion."

SACHREGISTER: Non-conformity to certain Neo-Latin and English usages has already been remarked and illustrated. All German nouns being capitalized, the use of lower-case initials for English and other nouns which, however common, have become quasi-proper names in titles is in the SR disturbingly conspicuous. Thus: "guardian, The," "proverbs, Outlandish," "tattler, The," "babillard, Le," "marcia, La." It is awkward, further, in a series punctuated uniformly with the foregoing, to repeat the key-word as in "art, L'a. d'aimer," "descrizione, Nuova d. di Roma," "impostoribus, Liber de tribus i.," "maid, The nutbrown m." and the like. Except that one should read under "Giornale" "orizzontale," under "Histoire" "bénédictins," under "Hystori" "ersterung," under "Lettres" "iroquoises," under "Saratoga" "Burgoyne," I have detected few errors.

PERSONENREGISTER: Here too, though typographical slips abound, I call attention only to the names of Roger Ascham, Sir Thomas Browne, Joh. Ehr. Kapp, Henry Knyghton, George Mackenzie, Stephen Riou, and to the fact that (under "Bressand") "Porus" is *Alexandre*, that "Leland" wrote on "Christian Revelation," that "Reinmar" was a "videler," and that under "Mazzuchelli" "civè" should be "cioè."

WORTREGISTER: The WR generously covers not only the texts in this edition, but also Lessing's letters in vols. xvii and xviii of Lachmann-Muncker and sundry translations not everywhere accessible. Peculiarities of his vocabulary, such as a perhaps unsuspected ratio of foreign words, and of his usage—e. g. a curious indifference as between dative and accusative endings after certain prepositions—are fully and intelligibly displayed, with specific references. But the WR is in no sense a concordance. It omits many current words and expressions and does not seek completeness of reference even in words and expressions listed. Thus the word "Ehre," illustrated by fifteen citations altogether, gets only one from *Minna von Barnhelm*, and this in the common-place expressions "Wenn ich dich auf meine Ehre versichere . . . auf meine Ehre verspreche"—in the SR indeed *Minna* iv, vi (vol. II, p. 72) is adduced s. v. "Ehre." Similarly, "Fertigkeit" is interpreted as "Bereitschaft" in "Fertigkeit zum Tod," as "Gelaufigkeit" in "wussten ihre Rollen mit der Fertigkeit, die . . . erfordert wird," but there is no attention to the "Verwandlung der Leidenschaften in tugendhafte Fertigkeiten"; in fact, "Verwandlung" and "tugendhaft" are not represented at all, and "Leidenschaft" is cited, not from the *Dramaturgie*, but solely from the *Wörterbuch* to Logau. SR, again, has "Leidenschaft," with a reference to *Dramaturgie* (vol. v, p. 327), but no "tugendhaft," no "Fertigkeit," and "Verwandlung" only "des Schauplatzes."

Manifest errors are few. Lessing's "auführisch" (ix, 50, 10;

469, 1) here becomes "aufruhrerisch"; for "corpus delecti" read "corpus delicti"; likewise for "desparat" read "desperat"; "Enargie" (iv, 358, 38) is missing, "encherieren" is not well rendered by "schoner machen, verbessern"—"verteuern" would be a more exact equivalent: in Lessing's context "aufputzen" or even "aufdonnern" would express the idea; "fliegend" is entered, but Tellheim's "fliegende Hitze" has to be sought under "Hitze"; under "Gemut" read "caractère" and "caractères"; under "mehr" read "notre"; under "mit" (as also under "nach," "von," and "zu") it is surely misleading to say "mit Akk."—under "aus," likewise under "bei" some few "accusatives" are adduced—the simple fact, however it is to be explained, seems to be that Lessing prefers declensional *-n* to *-m* he writes, certainly, "bei dem Durchblattern" (iv, 104, 14), but "bei so ubeln Wetter" (iii, 100, 32), "bei weiten" (v, 289, 13), "bei einen von den neuern Weltweisen" (ix, 306, 19), "mit mehrerm Rechte" (ix, 365, 27), "mit allem Rechte" (ix, 393, 8), "mit nächstem" (v, 351, 7), but "mit anbrechenden Morgen" (viii, 44, 31), "mit mehrern Ruhm" (ix, 309, 17)—for euphony?—; he prints "nach ihn hin" (vii, 115, 32), "nach niemanden" (xiii, 291, 10), but on the same page (l. 12) "nach seiner Bequemlichkeit"; he prints "von etwas andern" (ii, 108, 5)—though the MS has "andern"—and "von niemanden" (v, 411, 26), but on the same page (l. 29) "von dem, was ich," and (v, 336, 13) "keines von beidem"—similarly, "zu so einem Frevel" (ii, 144, 27) and "zu einen Dichter" (ix, 168, 37); under "Mittage" read "notre"; under "stille" read "forte"; "verlegen" is in its alphabetical place, but without reference to "von den Herausgebern verlegener Handschriften" (iv, 28, 15).

If accumulated, *Errata* would make a considerable heap. But we do not forget that twenty-five volumes are here passed in review, nor that the lexicological work is an innovation. Even with no allowance made for the troublous times during which this edition was taking shape, the complexity of the editorial task predisposes a benevolent critic to a larger measure of charity than the performance actually calls for. With all its imperfections on its head, the Bong *Lessing* is a decidedly useful edition. It takes its place in an honorable tradition; it has present value; and it has a future. Whatever of artistic finish it now lacks can be attained and, let us hope, will be attained. When circumstances make revision possible, I should suggest that a single man be appointed to consolidate the gains made by the able collaborators in this issue.

W. G. HOWARD

Harvard University

King Jasper: a poem. By EDWIN ARLINGTON ROBINSON. With an introduction by ROBERT FROST. New York: Macmillan, 1935. Pp. xviii + 110. \$2.00.

King Jasper, finished shortly before Robinson died, and presumably his last poem, is of a kind which he had made peculiarly his own—blank-verse narrative laid out on a pretty considerable scale, and largely taken up with talk and with a lavish of detail minutely precise. Probably it is in this kind that his poetry is best known, thanks to the immense success of *Tristram*. And certainly it is in this kind of poetry that some of his most interesting work was done. But not, I think, his best: perhaps because blank verse narrative suited some of his idiosyncrasies too easily. It was when his imagination prescribed for itself a certain necessary limitation of its scope, a strict shapeliness for its energy, that his genius worked with its finest felicity.

But *King Jasper* should have been one of the most interesting of the blank-verse narratives, for it is done with all Robinson's skill and subtlety and expatiating nicety, and its theme is a version of the world's very present sense of the instant and formidable future—a version in terms of the most modern actuality. But it hardly turns out what it promises to be. There is no diminution of power; natural manner has not set in a fixed and facile habit. Yet our interest is baffled by the fact that so much has to be surmised which ought to have been made especially clear. The poem, in fact, is an extreme case of Robinson's characteristic procedure in narrative. It puts before us a series of intricate psychological situations; on the exact and vivid portrayal of these the poet concentrates all his art; and we have to make out as best we can, from their description, the story out of which they arise and to a very large extent the persons concerned in them. In the Arthurian narratives, for instance, this method did exceedingly well, for there the story and the persons—at least, what the persons stand for in the story—are common knowledge. But here the story is the poet's own private invention, and he keeps it to himself. The main outline is clear enough; but just when we come to the crucial issues of the story—the very point which Robinson seems most interested to make, and to which he seems to invite his readers' interest—we are left guessing. Evidently, the story meant a very great deal to the poet. We must not say, it meant merely the opportunity for psychological situations, for these are inspired by the story as a whole and are pregnant with its significance. But we cannot fully understand them, because we do not know what the story is. So with the characters. What does Zoe stand for in the story? Why does "the Queen" hate her? That is a very important factor in the situations that arise; but we are told nothing about it. Zoe, no doubt, is the New Life—the

right kind. Young Hebron, too, is the New Life—the wrong kind. But as we know nothing more about them than just that, their conflict, instead of being impressive, is curiously abstract and insignificant; and its melodramatic conclusion seems mere unnecessary sensationalism.

If, to this extent, Robinson's purpose in *King Jasper* defeated itself, that is comparatively unimportant. The poem falls nobly into its place in the poet's whole career. The tragic fact that it was his last is but an accident. The true artist cannot live without continually experimenting with his own powers; and a truer artist than Robinson never existed. *King Jasper* was an experiment in determining how far he could push his exquisite skill in allusive indirect narration. It was, for him, an experiment that had to be made; and its failure does honor to the absolute sincerity of his genius. But there was no failure in poetic power, which lives as vividly as ever in the delineation of the series of the poem's psychological crises. We must be careful, however, in criticizing Robinson, of that too accommodating word, "psychological." The delineation itself, as usual with him, is not psychological: it is not an analysis of a mental state, not a description of mental movement. It is an account of behavior; an account subtle, precise, minute; always capable of being exactly realized in the reader's imagination, and marvellously capable of recording the finest gradations of behavior, whether of the body or of the mind. But from what psychological chemistry this behavior emerges, that, as in actual life, we must infer for ourselves. This method, at once objective and delicate, is much more elastic than the keenest subjective analysis could be, and has a much more compelling power of suggestion. Here, for instance, are some of Robinson's variations in *King Jasper* on that infinitely variable article of behavior, *smiling*:

[The queen] hearing the king coming down the stairs
Arranged a smile. . . .
 Young Hebron *made a new smile* with his lips. . . .
The queen subdued
 A smile by the old way of biting it
 Before it happened. . . .

This potent simplicity of language is, in each context, charged with extraordinary meaning, which it is the reader's business, not the poet's, to elicit. Of more obvious power, perhaps, is such a phrase as this:

He fed his admiration till she wondered
If all her clothes were on.

Both the characters concerned are implied in that.

In a word, *King Jasper* carries on the conspicuous virtues of Robinson's blank verse narratives; but, far from merely repeating their method, is a bold, too bold, experiment in its development.

Students of his work will hardly fail to note its importance; but they will hardly fail to note also that, however successful it might have been, it had not in it the seeds of such perfect art as *Mr. Flood's Party*. And they will read with delight Robert Frost's characteristic appreciation, full of truth and wisdom.

LASCELLES ABERCROMBIE

Merton College, Oxford

Mr. Pepys and Mr. Evelyn. By CLARA MARBURG. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1935. Pp. xii + 156. \$2.00.

Miss Marburg's monograph is a study of the two diarists based largely on the voluminous correspondence which paralleled their forty years of friendship. Thirty-seven hitherto unpublished letters, mostly by Evelyn, are reproduced in full. Evelyn's letter to Pepys on the occasion of Pepys' first trip abroad—a veritable French Baedeker; interminable epistles offering historical background for Pepys' proposed *Navalia*, a series relating to the unsuccessful suit of John Jackson for the hand of Evelyn's granddaughter; and a group of twenty-five dealing with the period when Evelyn was Commissioner for the Sick and Wounded from the Dutch Wars. The last mentioned are particularly interesting as presenting Evelyn, not in the rôle of a mere unofficial observer of the times, but as a public official engaged in a valiant attempt to alleviate the sufferings and "extreamest misery" of prisoners and veterans in the face of opposition, broken faith, and lack of support from his superiors. "I cannot do miracles," he protests. "You must cooperate or we shall be forgotten." "I say helpe now by an highhand. dreadfull will be ye consequences." Such passionate cries are not unuttered to-day among those concerned with the administration of relief, but they come strangely from lips used to voicing more gentle and learned discourse.

Throughout her interpretation Miss Marburg has emphasized and, as the reviewer believes, exaggerated the contrast between Pepys and Evelyn as types. Granted that they were by nature extrovert and introvert, that the aesthetic appreciation of one were impeccable while gusto for the new or unusual led the other to be less discriminating, there is danger in drawing such a demarcation without fuller analysis. Evelyn was born to the cultural tradition, a tradition whose proponents graced not only the firesides of London but were to be found round many a country hearthstone throughout England. Pepys' heritage was alien to this. The son of a tailor, he was an outsider in a land where even the best American model of the self-made man had no place either of authority or respect among the virtuosi. To be acceptable to them, he must not

only acquire a body of knowledge but he must observe, analyze and develop for himself certain intellectual attitudes and points of view which were as much part of them as the air they breathed. Evelyn was his constant counsellor and guide in the process of becoming one not "of a company of *Pedants* & superficial persons; but of *Gentlemen* and Refined Spirits that are universally Lern'd, that are *Read, Travell'd, Experienc'd* and *Stout*." The final result of that education was, however, a mind no less sound than Evelyn's in its tastes and judgments.

The history of Pepys' relationship with Dr. John Wallis is an illuminating example of his gradual growth in appreciation of personality. The diary gives his first appraisal,—based on Wallis' usefulness to his own progress. "Here was also Dr. Wallis, the famous scholar and mathematician, but he promises little" This was in 1666. In 1695 upon receiving a copy of Wallis' mathematical history, he acknowledged it thus: "You never placed a favour where it was received with more esteem and veneration," and five years later it was this man's portrait he caused to be hung in the halls of the university as the embodiment of the cultural ideal. Pepys had grown to judge men not for their value to him but for their own characteristics.

Miss Marburg describes Evelyn's activities in his relation to his library as one factor responsible for his being "so much above others" in learning and taste. Pepys, as the Admiralty executive, may well have been "too much occupied with the affairs of the Navy or with drinking buttered ale at the Swan to follow Evelyn in his excursions through the libraries of England," but there is ample evidence in his later letters that he, too, had personal contacts both with their librarians and the contents. It was Pepys' and not Evelyn's patronage that Dr. Charlett, mutual friend of both at Oxford, sought when he wanted entry to the Cottonian Library for one of his students. And concerning this same promising young bibliophile, Charlett wrote a year later, "Mr.^r Wanley is designing to get leave for London. I know you will be the first person he will make his court to, from whom whatever concerns the rough and aged, or smooth and moderne parts of learning in this University, you shall receive, in hopes of his returning back again laded with new acquisitions and improvements of skill and knowledge from your informations, counsels and assistance, of all which my long experience of yours most obliging and communicative and most diffusive candor has given him expectation." Pepys once described his books as "what I can think to leave most valuable in the world." His brief and concise "Conditions of a Private Library" are proof that he sought to make his collection not a mere possession but the outward and visible sign of inward knowledge and wisdom.

Mr. Pepys and Mr. Evelyn is a very readable book and the student taking it at random off the shelf will find enjoyment in its intimate

picture of seventeenth-century life. Aside from its contents, the slim scarlet-bound volume has a charm that would please Pepys himself and the University of Pennsylvania Press deserves commendation for the format.

JOAN CHATER HARAP

Cleveland

John Arbuthnot, Mathematician and Satirist. By LESTER M. BEATTIE. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1935. Pp. xvi + 432. \$3.50 (Harvard Studies in English, xvi.)

"The only omission which we note in his biography," wrote a reviewer of Aitken's *Life and Works of John Arbuthnot* (1892), "is a critical estimate of his hero's character as a man and a humorist." This lack has been filled at last by a book marking the two hundredth anniversary of Dr Arbuthnot's death. Although little new biographical material is recorded, the critical analysis of the intellectual and literary procedures of Arbuthnot is a real contribution. He is presented as a representative of two worlds: as friend and collaborator of Swift and Pope and as Fellow of the Royal Society, Censor in the College of Physicians, and Physician to the Queen; as author not only of the *Scriblerus Papers*, but also of essays on the *Usefulness of Mathematical Learning* and the *Effect of Air on Human Bodies*. Mr. Beattie's treatment is comprehensive: he outlines the contents of Arbuthnot's numerous pieces, supposed and authentic, reanimates the background of the controversial tracts; surveys relevant scholarship; and reargues questions arising from composite authorship. The final chapter is a penetrating appraisal of the "thrifty style, good sense, and tolerant humor of a highly civilized man" in the light of the interplay between his talent for satire and his training in mathematics and medicine.

Mr. Beattie follows tradition in upholding Arbuthnot as the main author of the John Bull pamphlets—but not without an exhaustive consideration of Teerink's arguments (published in 1925) in favor of Swift as chief collaborator. Internal evidence for Arbuthnot, according to Mr. Beattie, includes the structural incoherence of the allegory, the light-hearted detachment in tone, the sympathetic treatment of Jack (Presbyterianism) and Peg (Scotland) and the relatively mild satire of Frog (Holland) and Hocus (Marlborough). External evidence consists chiefly in the well-known words of Pope to Spence and of Berkeley to Percival, together with what Mr. Beattie considers "the central pier" for Arbuthnot's support—Swift's statements in the *Journal*. But these very statements Teerink argued—rather convincingly—constitute Swift's veiled admission that he himself wrote *John Bull*.

Arbuthnot is absolved from authorship of several anti-Woodward tracts connected with the smallpox quarrel of 1719, among them the second Dr. Tripe pamphlet. The first, addressed to Nestor Ironside (written in 1713; published by Morpew in 1714), is also cast out, but without the notice which seems its due. This anti-Steele pamphlet, which is in the vein but without the anger of Swift's *Importance of the Guardian Considered* (Oct., 1713—against Steele's *Dunkirk*), Scott associated with Swift and Arbuthnot. Dilke believed it Swift's. Others have said the Scriblerus Club. (It will be remembered that Dennis accused Pope of it and that Pope connected it with Dr. Wagstaffe's name.) The ostensible provocation was the scoff in *Guardian*, 174 (30 Sept., 1713) at "the sage gentlemen of the faculty" in Bath; but the animus is clearly political with its rise in Steele's recent tract on *Dunkirk* (22 Sept.)—which is an attack on the Tory Peace Treaty—and in his projected *Crisis*. Mr. Beattie does not even mention another anti-Steele tract. *An Invitation to Peace, or Toby's Preliminaries to Nestor Ironsides* (1713), listed by Aitken, in both his *Arbuthnot* and the *CHEL.*, among Arbuthnot's doubtful works. It appears to the present writer that justification for reconsidering the authorship of both these anti-Steele tracts in a book on Arbuthnot might have been found in a document first printed in it (pp. 413-16): a memorandum to Oxford, in Arbuthnot's hand, "Concerning the Peace" (dated 16 April 1713), which outlines methods of combatting expected opposition to the Peace Treaty.

Mr. Beattie is perhaps too much inclined in working out his ascriptions to regard as a touchstone for Arbuthnot's pen the "innocently humorous" For example, Arbuthnot's share in the collaborate enterprise, *Three Hours after Marriage*, he believes to be "slight" because of the severity of the Woodward satire. Mr. Sherburn's view, however, in his *Early Career of Pope* is that the chief stimulus came from Arbuthnot, "who satirized the geological studies of Dr. Woodward in a Scriblerean manner." The kindly humanity of Arbuthnot, of which his friends—Pope, Swift, Gay, and Chesterfield—spoke so eloquently, could never be doubted, but like his fellow satirists he had strong political convictions and an intellectual conscience.

RAE BLANCHARD

Goucher College

The Life of Washington Irving. By STANLEY T. WILLIAMS. New York: Oxford University Press [London: Humphrey Milford], 1935. 2 vols. Pp. xxiv + 501; viii + 445. \$15.00.

The last word concerning the author who amiably satirized Connecticut Yankees for their onion-eating and conceived Ichabod

Crane as the apotheosis of New England pedagogy has been written by a professor in New Haven. Mr. Williams has located in widely scattered spots a rich mass of unpublished letters and documents. He has culled biographical facts and built up a pertinent background from a great variety of printed sources. Finally, he has studied at first hand the scenes of Irving's life, particularly in Spain. Nothing of significance, it seems, has escaped his drag-net.

In using this material, Mr. Williams locates manuscripts so definitely and cites other sources with such a high degree of accuracy that his annotations become an exhaustive guide to the study of Irving. Much information of interest only to scholars is relegated to extensive appendices and notes, and the narrative of Irving's long career is thus left free to move steadily through six hundred pages of text. It pauses only rarely, as the biographer weighs all evidence concerning Irving's proposal to Emily Foster or analyzes Spain under the Regency. In dealing with such matters, there are few opportunities for stylistic excellence; but the main story of Irving's life and the sketches of the men and scenes about him are written with color and vigor. Here is distinguished prose such as learned biographers, unhappily, do not often achieve. Particularly memorable are the passages in which Irving's moods are set down intimately but honestly, with no trace of the fraudulence which sometimes mars the work of psychoanalytical biographers.

The announced purpose of the book is to evaluate Irving's "career and writings in fusion with the literary criteria of his own day," rather than by the standards of perfection. Fortunately Mr. Williams ends, as should be the privilege of every biographer, by doing both. Judged among his contemporaries, Irving fares reasonably well. His indecisiveness and his love of Europe are contrasted unfavorably with Cooper's pugnacity and his nationalism—but a handful of Coopers is enough to salt any generation. Irving and Bryant are not explicitly compared, but they may be justly placed together as authors famous primarily because accident made them pioneers. In relation to his lesser contemporaries, to whose feeble sensibility reference is occasionally made, Irving seems a virile genius. Judged absolutely, he comes off rather badly. Mr. Williams is careful to credit Irving with charm and amiability, spasmodic energy, and an uncritical honesty. He is equally careful to demonstrate that Irving was too often indolent, irresolute, and blind to the great issues of life, and that his writings are frequently "clumsy," "childish," "foolish," or "ridiculous." Most damaging are the contrasts between the weaknesses of Irving and the merits of such younger men as Poe, Emerson, Hawthorne, and Melville—contrasts which are, of course, no measure of Irving in his own age but an index to the swift development of American literature from generation to generation. This rigor of judgment gives a wholesome astringency to the book—and demonstrates that a scholar

can live with an author for a decade without falling into the common delusion that the latter is an inexcusably neglected genius of the first water. Sharply critical, meticulously yet attractively written, and truly definitive, this life of Irving sets a new standard for scholarly biographies of American authors.

TREMAINE McDOWELL

University of Minnesota

Les Lais de Marie de France. By ERNEST HOEPFFNER. Paris: Boivin et Cie., 1935. Pp. 179. 15 fr.

Where so little is known and so much hypothetical as in the case of Marie de France and her works, it is always well to have the material passed upon by as many competent scholars as possible. Hoepffner, however, is conservatively eclectic regarding the main issues and adds nothing new here. His personal contribution to this book consists, aside from his pleasant literary analyses of the tales, in his use of arguments familiar to most students from his numerous articles: he posits the presence or absence in Marie's works of various literary influences and deduces wide-ranging conclusions from his findings. Unfortunately, he seems not to realize the fundamental difficulties involved in this procedure, for instance, that a given author may be immune to current fashions on certain occasions, though influenced by them on others, that vague likenesses of theme and language in contemporaneous authors do not necessarily imply definite literary relationships, that poets may well be aware of the commonplaces of human behavior without borrowing them from literature.

Thus he would have us believe (p. 61) that *Lanval* must have been written before the vogue of *Eneas* because the subtle analysis of love made popular by the latter poem is absent from the former. Yet it is possible to imagine that Marie, whether writing before or after the *Eneas*, might, for a variety of reasons, have felt no imperative need in telling this particular tale to follow this particular fashion. Incidentally, the arguments advanced here and at greater length in *Romania* LIX, 1933, 351 ff., to prove that Marie when writing *Lanval* knew only the *Brut* and *Thèbes* but not *Eneas* seem to me far from convincing since H. freely assumes that all passages reminiscent of *Eneas* must be interpolations, fortuitous resemblances or of secondary value, whereas only those passages recalling *Thèbes* are "de valeur probante." It might well be objected that to the unprejudiced reader the accusations of the Queen in *Lanval* and of Lavinia's mother in *Eneas* are as conclusive evidence of relationship as any of the posited likenesses between

Lanval and *Thèbes*, and that if, as E. Fredrick has recently suggested (*PMLA*, L, 1935, 984), *Eneas* should be dated before 1155, there is no reason why Marie might not have known interpolated versions of this work.

Again, what possible proof of influence emerges from equating lines like these (p. 98):

Je eunt qu'il est de halt parage (*Eneas* 1285)
Ne sai s'il est de haute gent (*Elduc* 389),

or from remarking that the two lovelorn heroines of these poems both suffer from insomnia and make confidants of those about them? Similarly (pp. 130-1), because of certain general resemblances between Marie's *Dous Amanz*, the anonymous *Piramus et Tisbé* and Thomas' *Tristan*, H. posits the influence of Marie's *lai* on the other two works, assuming for good measure that Marie knew their sources. It should be remarked, however, that the parallel between *Piramus* and *Tristan* (both of which contain the rhyme *embrace · face* and the word *cors*, absent from *Dous Amanz*) is closer than that between either of these poems and Marie's *lai*, and, more especially, that since all three passages are concerned with a "Liebestod," they could hardly avoid the obvious references to lovers' embraces that they contain.

Again, in discussing *Yonec*, H. states that "aucune hésitation n'est possible: elle [la jeune femme, la malheureuse victime d'un vieux mari jaloux] vient . . . en droite ligne de la chanson lyrique, du type si répandu de la mal-mariée" (p. 80) and he concludes regarding *Guigemar* and *Elduc* (p. 170) that Marie "sait, pour l'avoir lu dans l'*Eneas*, comment l'amour naît dans un cœur encore vierge, comment il se manifeste, quels sont les effets qu'il produit." In the absence of more objective evidence than that offered by H., one may perhaps be forgiven for asking why an experienced woman like Marie de France must necessarily have turned to literary sources for her descriptions of such not infrequent phenomena as maidens in love and unhappily married wives.

These instances, among many, must suffice. That Marie was influenced by the literary fashions current in her day, no one would deny, and H. has done well to point out the likenesses in phrase and plot that he has found, but he inevitably invites scepticism when he attempts to base extensive and specific conclusions concerning the dates, sources and chronology of the *lais* and concerning their relation to the *Lais anonymes* upon the tenuous and uncertain evidence afforded by general resemblances between the works of contemporaneous poets.

Bryn Mawr College

GRACE FRANK

Aspects géographiques du langage (avec 19 cartes), conférences faites au Collège de France (décembre 1933). Par KARL JABERG. Paris · Droz, 1936. Pp. 106.

Le livre de M. Jaberg montre ce savant à l'apogée de sa carrière scientifique. On peut mesurer le chemin accompli depuis l'apparition de ses opusculs "Sprachgeographie" (1908) et "Über die assoziativen Erscheinungen in der Verbalflexion einer sudostfranzosischen Dialektgruppe" (1906), où la préoccupation géographique se mettait au service de la biologie, en comparant avec eux les deux principaux chapitres du livre de 1936, "aires sémantiques" et "aires morphologiques" (le premier chapitre, d'introduction, résume les notions fondamentales sur lesquelles se basent les atlas linguistiques), chapitres qui reprennent les deux séries de problèmes qui ont retenu depuis ses débuts l'intérêt du savant suisse. Le changement important intervenu c'est la tendance *historique*. bien entendu, M. Jaberg subordonnera toujours ses tracés géographiques à des constatations *biologiques du langage* en général (à remarquer ce mot dans le titre), il ne s'agit pas tout simplement de stratifications à l'intérieur de l'italien et du français, que M. Jaberg peut suivre, en les comparant, sur les Atlas linguistiques français et italien,—il veut servir la linguistique générale, en établissant, par sa méthode de géographie linguistique comparée, p. ex. les lois qui régissent la polysémie ou la monosémie, ou celles présidant aux régularisations analogiques en morphologie ("l'exagération périphérique des caractères morphologiques"), et par là, il rejoint les "néolinguistes" italiens comme Bartoli. Dirai-je pourtant que mon esprit de romaniste se sent le plus vivement intéressé là où M. J. aboutit à des conclusions d'ordre historique sur l'état linguistique différent de l'Italie et de la France, p. ex. quand il compare l'action unitaire de Paris et celle, pluraliste, des nombreux centres citadins en Italie, quand il met en lumière la résistance de ces centres à certaines innovations (partic. en *-*esto*), ou quand il montre l'organisation sémantique nouvelle imposée à une famille de mots (*caput* 'bout,' non pas 'tête') en italien par l'irruption du mot de la langue littéraire (*testa*, d'origine gallo-romane)? Le grand progrès réalisé par l'école suisse vis-à-vis de son maître Gilliéron, c'est cette introduction du 'concret historique' au lieu de l'abstraitisme constructiviste, cette utilisation de toutes les sources historiques (et aussi de toutes les sources historiques de la langue disponibles: atlas, dictionnaires de patois, textes anciens, ethnologie, folklore, histoire de la civilisation), en vue d'un but aussi imposant que l'est l'explication du pourquoi du devenir *tel et tel* d'une langue déterminée. M. J. s'explique avec toute sincérité sur l'avance qu'a atteinte au point de vue de l'interpénétration de l'histoire et de la géographie, l'école allemande parallèle: sûrement, l'histoire territoriale si compliquée du do-

maine allemand a encouragé les études de Frings, alors que la France unifiée depuis Henri IV n'a pas connu ce morcellement politique et linguistique, mais il faut dire aussi que Frings n'avait pas à ronger le frein qu'imposait aux savants suisses l'imagination de mathématicien d'un Gilliéron ou d'un de Saussure. La conception saussurienne de la linguistique autarchique, se suffisant à elle-même, ne devant pas être asservie à l'histoire (pourtant la science de la langue n'est pas de la mathématique!)—je vois avec plaisir que le professeur de Berne s'en écarte délibérément et que la Suisse, carrefour d'idées, réussit à écarter les exagérations et à accepter les suggestions saines venant de partout. La géographie linguistique aura été la dernière école organisée dans le cadre des études de romanisme qui ait su grouper dans les derniers temps des savants de presque tous les pays—et c'est aux savants suisses, éminemment ouverts à toute critique et conciliateurs nés dans des questions débattues où des points de vue opposés s'affrontent, qu'on doit la cohésion et la continuité de cette école. Gilliéron a ouvert la voie avec sa génialité monomane et sauvage de grand oseur, Jud et Jaberg l'ont élargie, cimentée, humanisée.

Il n'y aura pas beaucoup à critiquer dans le détail. A la p. 51 le problème de *bellus* signifiant 'bon' en Italie méridionale ne me semble pas encore épuisé. Il y a un peu partout, et en dehors de la sphère du grec *καλός*, des incursions du beau sur le domaine du bon et viceversa: esp. *bonito* 'joli,' ital. *bell' e fatto* (à côté du dialectal *buono e* (ou *che*) *fatto*), à Berlin *schon* dit de mets (*eine schone Fischsuppe* m'a toujours choqué, moi qui, Viennois, étais habitué à qualifier de ce mot une symphonie de Beethoven ou une toile de Rembrandt!), le lat. *bellus* = **ben-ulus* lui-même. Les vers de la *Chanson de Ste Eulalie*: *Buona pulcella fut Eulalia, bel aurret cors, belezour anima*, traduisant la *καλοκαγαθία* chrétienne, l'anc. fr. *biaus amis* 'bon ami' (v. Tromm, *ZFSL*, LVI, p. 441) donnent aussi à réfléchir. Ne s'agirait-il pas d'idéaux moraux où la bonté et la beauté sont, non pas confondues après coup, mais indistinctes dès le début, de sorte que le linguiste aurait tort de séparer 'deux significations' alors qu'il n'y en a qu'une, celle de la 'vertu'?—L'explication des participes de la Haute Italie en -*esto* par la succession historique *movesto* (de *mosto*, d'après *posto*, *nascosto*), puis *piovesto*, puis *volesto*, *podesto*, *savesto*, parce que c'est là l'ordre numérique des formes trouvées dans l'atlas, ne m'a pas tout à fait persuadé: je ne vois pas de lien psychologique entre les verbes *muovere*, *piovvere*—*volere potere sapere*. Je me demande s'il ne faut pas dater ces formes bien plus haut, du temps préroman, pour les joindre au ptg. *comesto* = **coméd-tus* > *comestus*.

The Microscope and English Imagination. By MARJORIE NICOLSON. Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, Vol. XVI, No. 4. Northampton, Massachusetts, 1935. Pp. 92.

For several years Miss Nicolson has been interested in the influence that the progress of the new science in the seventeenth century had upon the history of ideas and upon the expression of these new ideas in literature. This monograph embodies some of the important results of her research, while a series of articles now appearing in various journals presents similar material upon the telescope and the imagination.¹ Since these complementary studies are almost identical in plan and method it will be desirable to consider them together in this review.

Each study begins with a long and detailed historical summary of the earliest microscopic and telescopic investigations in England and of the books in which the resulting discoveries were made known. The author then proceeds to chronicle the growth of popular interest in these aspects of the new science, drawing her material from a wide variety of sources, but centering her interest chiefly upon the references to the microscope and the telescope in literary works. The sections on the discovery and popularization of scientific knowledge, however, are designed to establish the foundations for Miss Nicolson's main thesis: that as Englishmen became aware of the revelations of the telescope and microscope, these discoveries and their implications profoundly influenced not only the creative imagination of leading writers, but also the entire trend of philosophical thought. Milton and Swift are the writers singled out for special discussion. *Paradise Lost*, says Miss Nicolson, would have been essentially different had Milton never looked through a telescope, and *Gulliver's Travels* owes its distinctive technique to the impressions which observations with a microscope (perhaps the one he bought for Stella) made upon Swift's mind.

Turning to philosophy, the author examines the effect of the microscope upon certain phases of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century thought, such as the long warfare between *ancient* and *modern*, the perennial controversies over whether *Nature* was characterized pre-eminently by regularity or by variety, the notion of a *scale of nature* as the principle of order in the universe, and the belief that the natural world was so constituted that it was infinitely full, containing a minutely graded hierarchy of forms from the highest to the lowest. The microscope made a significant contribution to all these subjects of speculation by affording apparent

¹ "The Telescope and Imagination," *MP*, xxxii (February, 1935), 233-60. "The 'New Astronomy' and English Literary Imagination," *SP.*, xxxii (July, 1935), 428-62. "Milton and the Telescope," *ELH.*, ii (April, 1935), 1-32.

scientific proof of many ancient metaphysical theories, especially the conception of *Nature* as a *plenum formatum*. The realization of this fact by contemporary Englishmen forms the subject of the last and most valuable section of Miss Nicolson's monograph, wherein she presents a wealth of interesting examples of the statement and elaboration of these ideas both in the popular scientific books and in the literary works of the period. The corresponding philosophical implications of the telescope's discoveries are indicated as the subject of a forthcoming article on the idea of the plurality of worlds.

The broad scope of Miss Nicolson's studies is made strikingly evident by this summary. Her purpose is no less than to reconstruct a little known chapter in the history of thought and literature. With a subject so comprehensive and abounding in so many ramifications it is not surprising to find that the author has not displayed the same high degree of thoroughness and competence in all phases of her work. From the mid-seventeenth century onward she is on ground wholly familiar to her, and her material is drawn from an extensive first-hand study of the original works, both scientific and literary. For the earlier period, however, she has, except for the outstanding literary works, depended for the most part upon secondary material, not always with any accurate perception of the comparative reliability of her authorities. More than that, she has introduced errors which a careful reading of the works she cited would have enabled her to avoid. For example, although rightly giving credit to Thomas Digges for his pioneer experiments with the telescope, she has consistently confused his dates and his work with those of his father, Leonard Digges. These faults destroy the value of what might otherwise have been a useful summary of the early history of the telescope in England. One notes, also, that Miss Nicolson's remarks upon Francis Bacon give the impression that his emphasis upon the necessity of instruments as aids to scientific discovery was an original and significant contribution. She overlooks the fact that a long line of English scientists preceding Bacon, including Digges, Dee, Norman, Blagrove, Gilbert, and Hopton, had not only proclaimed, but acted upon the belief that the furthering of scientific progress depended upon the continual invention and perfection of new mechanical devices and instruments.

To the student of literature the most striking feature of Miss Nicolson's studies will probably be her assertion that

as Milton in *Paradise Lost* produced a new kind of cosmic poetry, a drama of interstellar space, which could not have been written before the telescope opened to a generation of men a new vision of the universe, so *Gulliver's Travels* could not have been written before the period of microscopic observation, nor by a man who had not felt at once the fascination and the repulsion of the Nature which that instrument displayed.

This statement seems rather more sweeping than the evidence justifies. True, the author demonstrates conclusively that many ideas and much of the imagery of the two writers can be traced to the revelations of the new scientific instruments; that Swift must have looked through the microscope and Milton must have gazed through the telescope. Both *Paradise Lost* and *Gulliver's Travels* would not have been exactly the same had they been written a hundred years earlier. But can we go further than this? Is the essential theme and plan of either work one that could not have been conceived in an earlier age? Whatever may be our answer for Swift, for Milton we must not forget that the conception of the infinitesimal size of the earth in comparison to the vastness of cosmic space was far older than the invention of the telescope. It was a postulate of all works on astronomy from ancient times to Milton's day; not only the still popular medieval handbook of Sacrobosco, but also all the Renaissance textbooks stated and demonstrated that the earth was "but a point" in comparison with the universe. The phrases descriptive of the size of the earth which Miss Nicolson selects from Milton to support her point² are all to be found in the pre-Copernican treatises. In these works, also, we find the idea of endless space extending beyond the *primum mobile*; this was the infinite empyrean, home of God and the elect. It is this ancient conception of the inconceivably vast, yet finite universe, set in the midst of the greater infinite, that is the basis of Milton's cosmology. Granting that the revelations of the telescope may well have contributed to making Milton and others more imaginatively aware of the vastness of this universe, we must avoid exaggerating the importance of this new invention by attributing to it the existence in the seventeenth century of ideas that had been familiar postulates in the astronomical thought of the preceding centuries.

FRANCIS R. JOHNSON

Stanford University

Literatur- und Kunstkritik in ihren Wechselbeziehungen: ein Beitrag zur englischen Ästhetik des 18. Jahrhunderts Von KARL L. F. THIELKE. Halle (Salle): Niemeyer, 1935. Pp. 125. RM. 4.80. (Studien zur englischen Philologie, LXXXIV.)

Sir William Davenant's "Gondibert," its Preface, and Hobbes's Answer: A Study in English Neo-Classicism. By CORNELL MARSH DOWLIN. Philadelphia: 1934. Pp. 127. (University of Pennsylvania dissertation.)

Thielke's monograph is a rather superficial compilation on an

² "Milton and the Telescope," p. 21.

extensive and important subject. Brief quotations from critics of literature and the fine arts are grouped under broad topics, regularity vs. irregularity as aesthetic norms, universalizing vs. individualizing art, didactic purpose, *ut pictura poesis*, the hierarchy of the arts. Such a work as this, even if it does not offer important conclusions, may prove to be a convenient collection of *loci*; but Thielke's quotations are not always full enough to serve that end, nor do they adequately represent the richness of the field. The student of literature will get useful hints here on certain subjects with which he may not be familiar, such as the depreciation of portraiture, the stock criticism of Dutch and Flemish painting and its implications for realism, and the theory of landscape painting. An important conception not systematically treated here is that of eclecticism or the mechanical synthesis of beauties, in relation to both imitation and idealization. For trustworthy exposition of important points in this field we must still rely on the familiar and standard studies, such as Howard's work on the background of the *Laokoon* and the articles of Professor Lovejoy.

It may seem captious to suggest that if Thielke casts his net too wide, Dr. Dowlin does not cast his wide enough. He gives a close analysis of the Preface to *Gondibert*, and argues that Davenant owes at least as much to English critical tradition as to France and Italy. He finds in Hobbes and Davenant a native distrust of authority. In emphasizing this indigenous vein he gives the impression that continental criticism was exclusively authoritarian, but this view should be corrected by a consideration of such texts as those quoted in Gillot, *La querelle des anciens et des modernes en France* (1914). The argument is parallel in some respects to the controversy about the origins of the heroic play. Dowlin naturally argues for native origins, but the whole discussion is rather pointless, for, as Dr. Harbage has recently remarked, "Fletcherian tragicomedy, Caroline tragicomedy, the French heroic romance, and the Restoration heroic play itself are all part of one literary movement" (*Sir William Davenant* [Philadelphia, 1935], p. 242).

ALAN D. McKILLOP

The Rice Institute

Topographical Poetry in XVIII-Century England. By ROBERT ARNOLD AUBIN. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1936. Pp. xii + 419. \$3.50.

This is a useful study of "a definite if not very important literary province." The author defines topographical poetry as that which describes specifically named actual localities, and subdivides it into nine classifications, each of which he discusses in turn, dealing with changes in form, content, and point of view between 1640 and 1800.

The book is not easy reading. There is, of course, inherent difficulty in treating material unfamiliar to the reader and not very interesting in itself. Relegation of some of the detail to footnotes would have helped to clarify the exposition, though it would not have cured certain faults of organization and inconsistencies of definition. One example of confused thought will be found in the discussion, on pp. 67-70, of verse forms and poetic diction. And several of the pieces taken up in the brief section on sea-poetry hardly come within the scope of the study, unless the entire ocean is a "specifically named locality."

One misses most, perhaps, a discussion of the academic influence on topographical poetry, especially in and through the field of Anglo-Latin verse. Dr. Aubin refers once (p. 161) to college exercises, but he does not follow up the lead. Yet the custom of requiring students to describe contemporary scenes in classical Latin verse must have been a potent force in sustaining, shaping and directing topographical poetry. The great bulk of this verse, of course, never achieved print, but enough has survived in miscellanies to bear witness to its nature and probable extent.

A valuable adjunct to the general discussion is the list (nearly a hundred pages long) of topographical poems printed in England and America between 1640 and 1800. Certain omissions, however, make one doubt the "approximate completeness" of the bibliography. There seems to be no mention, for example, of Prior's *Down Hall*, Welsted's *Oikographia*, Cowper's *Montes glaciales*, or the well-known humorous tour of the tombs in Westminster Abbey which was printed in the 1716 edition of Tonson's miscellany. Dr. Aubin cites several poems from *Musarum Anglicanarum Analecta* (1699), but passes over others (e. g., those on the Sheldonian and on the Newmarket races), and he has missed still others which appear in later editions, such as the verses on Sturbridge Fair and Peckwater Quad. The notes, unhappily, have been printed at the end of the volume. But these are all matters of detail: it would be unfair and ungracious to demand perfection in the first attempt at a bibliography of so large and so uncharted a subject.

ARTHUR E. CASE

Northwestern University

BRIEF MENTION

The Anticlaudian of Alain de Lille, Prologue, Argument and Nine Books Translated, with an Introduction and Notes. By WILLIAM HAFNER CORNOG. Philadelphia, 1935. Pp. 192. University of Pennsylvania dissertation. Modern scholars habitually

avoid a thoroughgoing study of medieval allegory, perhaps because even in secular forms it is the medicated literature *par excellence*. If the history of the subject, however, is someday fully written, the *Anticlaudian* will certainly loom large because of its influence. For a long time students have needed a translation to use along with Moffat's rendering of the *Complaint of Nature*. As far as I have tested Dr. Cornog's work, it is skilfully managed, with a dignified, balanced style that is true to the original. In the Introduction Dr. Cornog shows acquaintance with most of the authorities, and wisdom in dealing with problems of date and source. His study of the influence of Bernard Silvester's work is worth special praise. Yet the Introduction as a whole is not quite satisfactory; its discussion is meager. It fails (as do the Notes) to make clear the nature of the indebtedness of the poem to Claudian, Macrobius, and certain others. It is entirely inadequate with regard to influence on other works, such as the borrowing in the *Roman de la Rose*, the *Régime de Fortune*, and elsewhere (cf. my *Goddess Fortuna in Medieval Literature*, Cambridge, 1927, pp. 127 ff.) The bibliography, which omits Neilson's study of the Court of Love, Post's *Medieval Spanish Allegory*, Raby's *Secular Latin Poetry*, shows why the poem is not placed more accurately in the development of allegory. And (this should be set down as a capital sin nowadays) there is no Index. Yet for what we do have here there is ample reason for thanks.

Smith College

H. R. PATCH

CORRESPONDENCE

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE AMERICAN NOVEL through 1850 by Lyle H. Wright of the Huntington Library, San Marino, California, is nearing completion. He would be grateful for information of out-of-the-way collections of novels in this country.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received]

Atkinson, Dorothy F.—Edmund Spenser, a bibliog supplement *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1937. xiv + 242 pp \$3 00.

Coleridge, Hartley.—Letters Ed by Grace E Griggs and Earl L Griggs. *London*: Oxford U. Press, 1936 Pp. xvi + 328 \$5 00

Fairchild, Arthur H. R.—Shakespeare and the arts of design (architecture, sculpture, and painting). *Columbia*: University of Missouri Press, 1937 Pp xii + 198 \$1 25 (U of Missouri Studies, Vol XII, January 1, 1937)

Foerster, Norman.—The American state university, its relation to democracy. *Chapel Hill*. U of North Carolina Press, 1937. Pp 287. \$2 50

Harbage, Alfred.—Cavalier drama, an historical and critical supplement to the study of the Elizabethan and Restoration stage *New York*. Modern Language Association of America, 1936 Pp x + 302 \$2 50

Langdale, Alram B.—Phineas Fletcher, man of letters, science, and divinity *New York*: Columbia U Press, 1937 Pp. viii + 230 \$3 00 (Columbia Studies in English and Comparative Literature, 125)

Pope, Alexander.—Prose works Vol I, the earlier works, 1711-1720. Ed by Norman Ault *Oxford* Shakespeare Head Press, 1936 Pp. cxxviii + 326 30 sh

Schroer, M. M. Arnold.—Englisches Handwörterbuch in genetischer Darstellung auf Grund der Etymologien und Bedeutungsentwicklungen, mit phonetischer Aussprachebezeichnung und Berücksichtigung des Amerikanischen und der Eigennamen *Hedelberg*: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1936 Pp xvi + 64. Rm'2 25

Thorson, Per.—Anglo-Norse studies, an inquiry into the Scandinavian elements in the modern English dialects, Part I. *Amsterdam*. N V Swets en Zeitlinger, 1936 Pp xii + 101 Guilders 2,80.

GERMAN

Bartz, Wilhelm.—Fremdwort und Sprachreinigung bei Friedrich Ludwig Jahn. Diss *Greifswald*: Adler, 1936 91 pp.

Baumgarten, A. — Wissenschaft und Sprache Rektoratsprogramm d. Univ Basel für das Jahr 1936 *Basel*. Reinhardt, 1936. 41 pp

Benz, Richard — Genius im Wort. Von deutschem Dichten und Denken [Deutsche

Reihe. Nr 42] *Jena*. Diederichs [1936]. 78 pp 80 Pf.

Blank, Bernhard.—Stefan George. Symbolische deutsche Dichtung um 1900 Diss. *Bonn*: 1936 45 pp.

Boesch, Bruno.—Die Kunstanschauung in der mhd. Dichtung von der Blutezeit bis zum Meistergesang Diss. *Bern*: Haupt, 1936 270 pp M. 4 80

Bornhardt, Wilhelm.—Die Flurnamen des Stadtkreises Goslar. Teil 1. Namen aus dem Bereiche des Rammelsberger Bergbaues [Beiträge zur Geschichte des Stadt Goslar. H 8]. *Goslar*: Geschichts- und Heimat-schutzverein, 1935 x, 62 pp M 3

Boyd, James.—Ulrich Fuetrer's *Parzival* Material and Sources [Medium Aevum Monographs I] *Oxford*: Basil Blackwell, 1936 vii, 172 pp 10 s. 6 d

Cafisch-Einicher, Emma.—Die lateinischen Elemente in der mhd. Epik des 13 Jhs [Prager deutsche Studien. H 47] *Reichenberg* & B : Kraus, 1936 xviii, 329 pp

Di Carlo, E.—Goethe a Palermo. Conferenza. *Palermo*. Tip. Flli Corselli, 1934 43 pp.

Dichtung, Die deutsche. Ein Jahrbuch. Hrsg von Richard Elsner *Berlin*: West-Ost-Verlag, 1936 224 pp M 5.40.

Diekmann, Ernst — Christian Dietrich Grabbe Der Wesensgehalt seiner Dichtung Versuch einer Deutung seiner Weltanschauung *Detmold*: Meyer'sche Hofbuchhandlung [1936] 251 pp M 4 50

Edda. Die Lieder des Codex regius nebst verwandten Denkmälern Hrsg von Gustav Neckel 1 Text 3 durchgesehene Aufl. [Germanische Bibliothek Abt. 2, Bd. 9]. *Hedelberg*: Winter, 1936. xii, 331 pp M 4 75.

Federmann, Arnold. — Johann Heinrich Meyer, Goethes Schweizer Freund, 1760-1832. [Die Schweiz im deutschen Geistesleben Bd 82] *Frauenfeld, Leipzig*: Huber [1936] 112 pp M 1 80.

Fontane, Theodor — Neunundachtzig bisher ungedruckte Briefe und Handschriften von Theodor Fontane. Hrsg u mit Anm versehen von Richard von Kehler *Berlin*. 1936 v, 127 pp 4*.

Frenzen, Wilhelm.—Klagebilder und Klagegebarden in der deutschen Dichtung des hofischen Mittelalters Diss Bonn [Bonner Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie. H 1]. *Wunzburg*. Triltsch, 1936 85 pp M 2 50.

Fritz, Martha.—Die Liedersammlung des Paulus von der Aelst, Deventer 1602 Diss Köln. *Lengerich* & W : Lengericher Handels-druckerei [1936] 101 pp

Gaitanides, Hans. — Georg Rudolf Weckherlin. Versuch einer physiognomischen Stilanalyse Diss *München*. [Ebner, 1936]. 181 typewritten pages.

Goebel, Otto.—Niederdeutsche Familiennamen der Gegenwart Gesammelt und erläutert *Wolfshagen-Scharbeutz*: Westphal [1936]. 116 pp M 2 50

Hammer, Lore.—Das Wahlen in Freiheit als Mittel zur Konfliktverschärfung im modernen Drama Diss. Heidelberg *Wurzburg*: Triltsch, 1936 76 pp

Hauptmann, Gerhart.—Der arme Heinrich. Eine deutsche Sage in fünf Akten. Ed with Notes and Vocabulary by Walter A Reichart and Philip Diamond. *New York*: F S Crofts & Co., 1936 xlv, 146 pp \$1.25

Hebbel, Friedrich.—Der Mensch und die Mächte Die Tagebücher, ausgewählt und eingeleitet von Ernst Vincent [Kroners Taschenausgabe Bd 144]. *Leipzig*: Kroner [1936] xxxi, 410 pp. M. 3 75.

Hefde, Hermann.—Resignation und Reflexion Materialien zu einem Kapitel einer Schillerbiographie *Braunsberg* 1935. 40 pp

Heiseler, Bernt von.—Stefan George [Colemans kleine Biographien. Bd. 67]. *Lubeck*: Coleman, 1936 64 pp 70 Pf

Hellingrath, Norbert von.—Holderlin-Vermächtnis Forschungen und Vorträge Ein Gedenkbuch zum 14 Dez 1936 Eingeleitet von Ludwig von Pigenot *München*: Bruckmann, 1936 188 pp. M. 3

Hellweg, Gustav.—Nikolaus Gryses Schriften als Quelle für Volksglauben und Sitte des 16 Jahrhunderts Diss Teildruck. *Hamburg* 1936 40 pp

Heyd, Gunther.—Goethe als Mensch und Deutscher [Die Goethe-Bücher] *Hamburg*: Gesellschaft der Goethe-Freunde, 1936. 59 pp. M 2 60

Insam, Matthias.—Der Lautstand des Burggrafenamtes von Meran Mit einer dialektgeographischen Studie. Mit 14 Abbildungen Diss München. *Leipzig*: Hirzel, 1936 vi, 101 pp. M. 5

Kappler, Helmut.—Der barocke Geschichtsbegriff bei Andreas Gryphius [Frankfurter Quellen und Forschungen zur german u. roman Philologie. H 13]. *Frankfurt a M.*: Diesterweg, 1936 76 pp. M. 2 60

Kayser, Wolfgang.—Geschichte der deutschen Ballade. Habilitationsschrift *Berlin*: Junker u Dünhaupt, 1936 x, 328 pp

Klatt, Fritz.—Rainer Maria Rilke Sein Auftrag in heutiger Zeit. *Berlin*: L. Schneider, 1936. 81 pp. M 1 85.

Leinweber, Walter.—Wortgeographie der Kreise Frankenberg, Kirchhain, Marburg. [Deutsche Dialektgeographie H 10]. *Marburg*: Elwert, 1936 95 pp. 67 maps. M 9 50

Lipphardt, Walther.—Studien zu den Marienklagen. [1.] Marienklage u. german. Totenklage [S.-A. aus PBB Bd. 58, H. 3]. [2.] Marienklagen und Liturgie. [S.-A. aus

Jahrbuch f Liturgiewissenschaft 1934]. Diss. Heidelberg. [Münster: Aschendorff] 1934 Pp 390-444, 198-205

Löhner, Heidi.—Deutschlands Anteil an der italienischen Romantik Diss [Sprache u Dichtung. H 62]. *Bern, Leipzig*: Haupt, 1936. viii, 152 pp M 3 60

Matthias, Wilhelm.—Bernburger Wörterbuch mit grammatischer Einleitung Diss. Teildruck *Marburg*. 1934 43 pp

May, Kurt.—Faust II Teil In der Sprachform gedeutet [Neue Forschung 30]. *Berlin*: Junker & Dünhaupt, 1936 viii, 279 pp 4°. M 12

Mémoires de la Société néo-philologique de Helsingfors, XI. V. Kiparsky, Fremdes im Baltendeutsch. Simon Roths Fremdwörterbuch, hrsg. von Emil Öhmann. *Helsingfors*: 1936 370 pp FM. 150.

Meyer, Rudolf.—Goethe, der Heide und der Christ. *Stuttgart*: Verl Urachhaus, 1936. 202 pp. M 2 85

Pensa, M.—La letteratura tedesca contemporanea, 1910-1935 Vol I *Bologna*: N Zanichelli, 1935. 247 pp L. 20

Ponick, Herbert.—Das Lebensbild eines deutschen Ingenieurs und Dichters Max Maria v. Weber (unter besonderer Berücksichtigung seiner Tätigkeit in Sachsen). *Dresden*: Volkmann, 1936 52 pp M 1 20

Riecke, Heinz.—Wesen und Macht des Heldischen in Ernst Jungers Kriegsdichtungen Diss *Hamburg*: 1935. 48 pp

Roehr, Hanna.—Frühzeit deutscher Dichtung [Lebendiges Wort 25] *Leipzig*: P List [1936] 62 pp. 75 Pf.

Roos, Carl.—Kleine deutsche Literaturgeschichte. *Kopenhagen*: Gyldendalske Boghandel [1936] 119 pp Kr. 4 75.

Schuchbauer, Margarete.—Fouqués Trauerspiel Alf und Yngwi. Diss. *Würzburg*: Mayr, 1936 50 pp.

Schütterle, Paul Erich.—Der Heimatroman in der deutschen Presse der Nachkriegszeit Diss Heidelberg. *Würzburg*: Mayr, 1936 118 pp

Schulz, Fr. Ernst.—Die Bühnenwerke von 1933-1936 (mit Nachträgen). [Schulz, Welt-dramatik Bd 3]. *Stuttgart*: Muth [1936]. 141 pp M 4 50.

Steiner, Johann.—Rilkes Verhältnis zu seiner Zeit. Diss *Gießen* 1936 viii, 159 pp.

Spiecker, Frank.—Luise Hensel als Dichterin. Eine psychologische Studie ihres Werdens auf Grund des handschriftlichen Nachlasses Mit einem Anhang bisher unveröffentlichter Lieder *Evanston, Ill*: Northwestern Univ, 1936. 207 pp.

Strassburger, Horst.—Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl und das deutsche Bauerntum. Diss. *Leipzig*: 1936. 51 pp.

Thorstein, Ulf.—Hermann Lons und seine volkische Sendung *Minden*: Kohler [1937] 128 pp. M 3 75

Tiedemann, Claus.—Gustav Stille. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der niederdeutschen Literatur des 20. Jh. Diss. Greifswald *Stade*: Hansa-Druckerei, 1935. 92 pp

Wehe, Walter.—Eichendorffs Romane in ihren geistes- und formgeschichtlichen Zusammenhängen. Diss. München. *Würzburg*: Tritsch, 1936. 91 pp.

Weinberg, Emil.—Die österreichischen Ortsnamen und ihre Bedeutung. Ein Nachschlagebuch mit einer Einführung in die österreichische Ortsnamenkunde Hrsg. mit Unterstützung des Bundeskommissars für Heimatdienst *Wien*: Deutscher Verl. f. Jugend und Volk [1936] 128 pp. M 3.

FRENCH

Bach, W.—B Constant u die Politik. Diss. *Leipzig*: 1936. 64 pp

Bauer, H. F.—Les "Ballades" de V Hugo. Paris. Champion, 1936. xlviii + 199 pp.

Benjamin, R.—Molière. *Paris*: Plon, 1936. ii + 243 pp. Fr 15

Brendel, H.—Pierre Mille u. die koloniale Frage in Frankreich. Diss. *Jena*: 1935. x + 93 pp

Brøndal, V.—Le français, langue abstraite *Copenhagen*. Levin & Munksgaard, 1936. 42 pp

Dumas, G.—Hist du "Journal de Trévoux" depuis 1701 jusqu'en 1762. *Paris*: Boivin, 1936. 210 pp. Fr. 25.

Du Val, T. E., Jr.—The Subject of Realism in the *Rdm* (1831-65). Penn diss. *Philadelphia*: 1936. 149 pp.

Ellis, H.—From Rousseau to Proust. *London*: Constable, 1935.

Flaubert.—Trois contes, éd. R. Dumesnil. *Paris*. Belles Lettres, 1936. Fr. 18.

—Contes, ed. Voilquin. *Paris*: Hachette, 1936. 96 pp. Fr. 1 50.

Fontaine, A.—Génie de Rimbaud. *Paris*: Delagrave, 1934. 120 pp

Graf, I.—Die Anfänge der französisch-kanadischen Dichtung. Diss. *Würzburg*: 1936. 108 pp

Grützmacher, H.—Pascal u. Port-Royal. Diss. *Hamburg*, 1935. 77 pp.

Guillemin, H.—Le Jocelyn de Lamartine. *Paris*: Boivin, 1936. 861 pp. Fr 75.

Hess, Herb.—Studien zum Mistere du Viel Testament. *Frankfurt*: Diesterweg, 1936. 170 pp.

Holzbecher, K.—Denkart u. Denkform von P. de Marivaux. Diss. *Berlin*: 1937. 69 pp

Junkersdorff, A.—Aufbau u. Stil der Erzählungen Vignys. Diss. *Münster*: 1936. v + 93 pp.

Kanonenberg, H.—Die Zeitung "L'Avenir" (Paris 1830-1). Diss. *Marburg*. 1935. vi + 72 pp

Klippel, M.—Die Darstellung der Frankischen Trojanersage in Geschichtsschreibung und Dichtung vom Mittelalter bis zur Renaissance in Frankreich. Diss. *Marburg*: 1935. x + 71 pp

Knauer, K.—Ein Künstler poetischer Prosa in der franz. Vorromantik. Marmontel. *Bochum*: Poppinghaus, 1936. vi + 158 pp.

Kupka, I.—Italienreisen in der franz. Lit. des 19. Jahrh. *Breslau*: Priebatsch, 1936. 113 pp

Ledos, E. G.—Hist. des catalogues des livres impr. de la Bibl. nat. *Paris*: Eds de la B. n., 1936. xx + 275 pp.

Mainone, Fr.—Formenlehre u. Syntax in der Berliner frankovenetianischen Chanson de geste Huon d'Auvergne. *Leipzig*: Noske, 1936. ii + 50 pp.

Maurer, E.—Die Unruhe bei Val. Larbaud. Diss. *Zürich*: 1936. 75 pp.

Mélanges Abel Lefranc. *Paris*: Droz, 1936. 506 pp. Fr 100

Meyer, Hans.—Rousseau u. Shelley. Ein typologischer Vergleich. Diss. *Halle*: 1934. vi + 109 pp

Montaigne.—Essais. Pages choisies, éd. R. Pintard. *Paris*: Hachette, 1936. 96 pp. Fr 1 50.

Musset.—Lorenzaccio, éd. F. Ségu. *Paris*: Didier, 1936. 223 pp. Fr. 10.

Poerck, G.—Introd. à la "Fleur des Histoires" de J. Mansel. *Ghent*: Claeys-Verheughe, 1936. 101 pp

Rau, E.—Das Périgord u. seine Bewohner in den Romanen E. Le Roys. Diss. *Münster*. 1936. 62 pp

Renaud, J.-J.—Les deux idoles, ed. C. F. Zeek and Lon Tinkle. *Boston*: Heath, 1937. viii + 241 pp

Ringelmann, A.—Henri Pourrat. Diss. *Würzburg*: 1936. x + 106 pp

Ruppe, F.—Das Problem der Landflucht im heutigen Fr u. seine Aktualität im Werke R. Bazins. Diss. *Jena*: 1936. x + 116 pp.

Schossig, A.—Verbum, Aktionsart u. Aspekt in der Hist. du Seigneur de Bayart. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1936. x + 251 pp. (*ZRP*h., 87.)

Schultz, I.—Bildhaftigkeit im franz. Argot. *Giessen*: Roman. Seminar, 1936. iii + 109 pp.

Šesták, A.—La notion du temps en fr. *Brunn*: 1936. 168 pp

Siaud, S.—La Comédie-Fr, son hist, son statut *Paris*: Libr de droit et de jurispr, 1936 viii + 272 pp Fr 30

Tharp, J. B.—Nous autres Américains, premier livre de lecture *New York*: Harper, 1936 220 pp.

— Study Manual (for use with preceding) *Ibid*, 1936

— Twenty-seven comprehension tests (for use with same). *Ibid*, 1936.

Tilley, A.—Mme de Sévigné *Cambridge*: Univ Press [N Y. Macmillan], 1936 xii + 160 pp. \$2 25.

Trepp, L.—Taine, Montaigne, Richeome *Diss Würzburg*: 1935 134 pp

Tuschen, A.—Die Taufe in der altfranz. Lit *Diss Bonn* 1936 iv + 191 pp

Wilmette, M.—Nos dialectes et l'histoire. *Paris*: Droz, 1935 71 pp Fr. 16.

ITALIAN

Antonibon, G.—Florilegio di motti, imprese e leggende in ordine alfabetico per soggetto *Padova*: A Draghi, 1936 89 pp L. 6

Bandelloni, Emilio (Ciofro).—Autobiografia *Firenze*: Tip Ammannati, 1935 301 pp

Bestaux, E.—La poésie de Lionello Fiumi *Paris*: Les Presses modernes, 1936 64 pp.

Bianchi, D.—Petrarca e Alfieri. *Milano-Genova*: Albrighi e Segati, 1935 27 pp

Bohringer, P. H.—Das Wiesel, seine italienischen und ratischen Namen und seine Bedeutung im Volksglauben *Basel diss Zurich*. Leemann, 1935 91 pp

Buck, A.—Der Platonismus in den Dichtungen Lorenzo de' Medici. *Berlin*: Junker und Dunnhaupt, 1936. 114 pp M. 5.

Bukaček, J.—Francesco Petrarca e la naziona boema. *Trieste*: R. Università, 1935.

Capasso, A.—Nota sul "Don Garzia" Saggio critico. *Savona*. Tip S Palagi, 1935 68 pp.

Ciarrocchi, A.—Annibal Caro Note bibliografiche. *Cvitanova-Marche*: Tip Ciarrocchi, 1935. 9 pp.

Colajanni, P.—Appunti autobiografici. *Calamassetta*: Arte del libro, 1935. vii + 128 pp.

Dell'Isola, M.—Carducci *Paris*: Presses fr, 1936. viii + 336 pp Fr. 40.

Fubini, M.—Storia della poesia alfieriana dal "Filippo" all' "Antigone." *Firenze*: "Civiltà moderna," 1935. 56 pp.

Gallo-Cristiani, A.—Giuseppe Marchese Studio critico-biografico *Napoli*: Studio di propaganda editoriale, 1934. 80 pp.

Gervasoni, G.—L'ambiente letterario mila-

nese nel secondo decennio dell'Ottocento. Angelo Mai alla Biblioteca Ambrosiana *Firenze*. L. S Olschki, 1936 4to, xxiii + 71 pp (Fontes Ambrosiani, in lucem editi cura et studio Bybliothecae Ambrosianae, moderante I Galbiati, XI)

Goldoni, Carlo.—Commedie scelte. Illustrate da G. Mantegazza *Milano*. Sonzogno, 1935 4to, 708 pp L 7

— I rusteghi, ed. A. Maienduzzo *Milano* A Vallardi, 1935 142 pp L 2 75 (Collana di cultura classica)

— La casa nova, ed E Allodoli *Palerma*: R Sandron, 1935 87 pp. L. 2.25. (Collezione classici italiani)

— L'osteria della posta, ed A. Maren-duzzo. *Milano*. C Signorelli, 1935 32 pp L. 2

— Un curioso accidente Con introduzione e commento di M Lombardi-Lotti *Firenze*: F Le Monnier, 1936 xxii + 66 pp L. 4 (Classici italiani commentati)

Malcovati, Erica.—La poesia latina di Giovanni Pascoli. *Bologna-Rocca S Casciano*: L. Cappelli, 1935 5 pp (Repr fr the "Atti del IV Congresso nazionale di studi romani")

Marino, Maria T.—La "Quaedam profetia." Testo e studio critico *Palerma*: Tip "Boccione del povero," 1934 139 pp L 10

Mezzo, G.—Gli animali parlano e l'uomo risponde. Zoologia leggendaria per il popolo e per le scuole. *Varallo*: Stamp. Aldina, 1935. 101 pp. L. 6

Mösch, W.—Die italienische Platonrenaissance und ihre Bedeutung für Frankreichs Literatur- und Geistesgeschichte (1450-1550) *Berlin*: Ebering, 1936 xxiv + 399 pp M 16 (Romanische Studien, 40)

Novelle italiane, dagli albori della letteratura ai giorni nostri. Con profili biografici, analisi estetiche e note esplicative a cura di D Provenzal. *Napoli*: Casa edit. A. Rondinella, 1936 438 pp L. 11.

Pasini, A.—Tomaso Nedani *Milano*: "Pro familia," 1934 52 pp L 1.20.

Rayberti, Giovanni — Il gatto *Milano*: Corbaccio, 1935. 131 pp. L 5

Ruffini, G.—Lorenzo Benoni Pagine della vita d'un italiano Nuova traduzione con note a cura di Mara Fabietti. Prefazione di E Fabietti. *Sesto S. Giovanni*: A. Barion, 1935 viii + 394 pp.

Schapiro, Elis.—Der Einfluss Euripides' auf die Tragodie des Cinquecento. *Munich* diss. 81 pp

Scolari, Claudia.—Severino Ferrari, poeta e filologo. Con prefazione di D. Manetti *Bologna*: Stab poligraf. riuniti, 1936. xxi + 199 pp. L 10.

Serena, S.—Scrittori latini del Seminario di Padova. Raccolta di prose e versi a cura di — Padova. Libr. Gregoriana, 1936. xxxi + 562 pp. L 25.

Sirven, P.—Vittorio Alfieri Vol II. Paris. Droz, 1935. 381 pp. Fr. 15.

Storost, J.—Studien zur Alexandersage in der älteren italienischen Literatur. Untersuchungen und Texte. Halle. Niemeyer, 1935. x + 330 pp. M 15. (Romanistische Arbeiten, XXIII.)

Torrini, Maria.—L' "Octavia." Pisa: U. Giardini, 1934. 93 pp.

Tschurtschenthaler, P.—Das Bauernleben im Pustertal. Bolzano: Vogelweider, 1935. viii + 246 pp.

Vella, Angela.—Giuseppe Ernesto Nuccio nei racconti della Conca d'Oro. Catania. Tip. G. Prigioti, 1934. 70 pp.

Weiss, C.—Laure et Pétrarque. Essai de psychologie amoureuse. Paris. Dorbon, 1935. 150 pp. Fr. 18.

Zecchini, A.—Cordialità di amicizia. Con lettere di Carducci, Del Lungo, Oriani e Saverio Regoli. Faenza: F.lli Lega, 1935. 271 pp.

SPANISH

Abbrén Gómez, E.—Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz. Bibliografía y biblioteca. México: Monografías Bibliográficas Mexicanas, 1934. xviii + 458 pp.

Alonso Cortés, N.—Artículos histórico-literarios. Valladolid: Imp. Castellana, 1935. 226 pp.

Badenhausen, R.—Das spanische Kostüm und seine Bedeutung für die Bühne. Diss. Munich. 1936. 87 pp.

Baker, F. M.—Las Cuevas de Artá, A Tale of Mallorca. Boston: Heath, 1936. iv + 84 pp. \$0.40.

Baroja, P.—Paradox, Rey, ed. C. E. Anibal. New York: Macmillan, 1937. lviii + 278 pp. \$1.80.

Boggs, R. S.—Outline Hist. of Sp. Lit. Boston: Heath, 1937. iv + 154 pp. \$0.60.

Campa, A. L.—The Spanish Folksong in the Southwest. Albuquerque: Univ. of New Mexico Bulletin, 1933. 67 pp.

—Spanish Religious Folktheatre in the Spanish Southwest. 2 v. Albuquerque: Univ. of New Mexico Bulletin, 1934. 71 + 155 pp.

Canfield, D. L.—Spanish Literature in Mexican Languages as a Source for the Study of Spanish Pronunciation. New York: Inst. de las Españas, 1934. 257 pp.

Castillo y Sparkman.—La Buenaaventura y otros cuentos III. Boston: Heath, 1937. vi + 56 pp. \$0.28.

Catálogo de las bibliotecas españolas en Hispanoamérica. Madrid: Junta de Relaciones Culturales, 1934. 143 pp.

Cervantes.—El hospital de los podridos y otros entremeses alguna vez atribuidos a —, ed. Dámaso Alonso. Madrid: Edit. Signo, 1936. 162 pp. 3.50 ptas.

—Impresiones y selección de trabajos, por J. Poch Noguer. Gerona-Madrid: Dalmau Carles, 1936. 178 pp. 190 ptas.

—Viaje del Parnaso, ed. F. Rodríguez Marín. Madrid: C. Bermejo, 1935. lxxxviii + 576 pp. 30 ptas.

Cossío, J. Ma. de.—Don Amós de Escalante. Madrid: Tip. de Archivos, 1933. 44 pp.

Cuartero y Huerta, B.—Versión que Fr. Lope de Vega Carpio hizo del Himno de Oro o Rosario rítmico por encargo del P. don Pedro Manuel Deza, monje cartujo de Santa María del Paular. Madrid: 1935. 78 pp. 3 ptas.

Ehrenbourg, I.—Duhamel, Gide. . . Unamuno vus par un écrivain d'U. R. S. S. Paris: Nouvelle Revue Française, 1934. 221 pp.

Espinosa, A.—Crimen. (Ensayos literarios.) Tenerife. "Gaceta de Arte," 1934. 82 pp. 5 ptas.

Gómez Charriño, Payo.—Cancionero de —, Almirante y poeta (siglo XIII), ed. A. Cotarelo y Valledor. Madrid: Góngora, 1934. 303 pp.

Góngora y Argote, Luis de.—Die Soledades des Don —. Übertragen und mit einer Einleitung versehen von H. Brunn. München: Hueber, 1934. viii + 180 pp.

González, Estebanillo.—La vida de —, hombre de buen humor, compuesta por él mismo. Ed. J. Millé y Giménez. 2 v. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1934. 262 + 270 pp. 12 ptas. ("Clásicos Castellanos," vols. 108 y 109.)

Hagedorn, María.—Reformation und spanische Andachtsliteratur. Luis de Granada in England. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz, 1934. 166 pp.

Henríquez Ureña, P.—Cien de las mejores poesías castellanas. Buenos Aires: Kapelusz, 1934. 238 pp.

Herrera, L. P.—Antología hispanoamericana. Poesías. Buenos Aires. Menéndez, 1934. 430 pp. 3 pesos.

Heseler, María.—Studien zur Figur des Gracioso bei Lope de Vega und Vorgängern. Hildesheim: F. Borgmeyer, 1933. 6 marcos.

Jiménez Rueda, J.—Juan Ruiz de Alarcón. México: Imp. Castellana, 1934. 47 pp.

Juan de la Cruz, San.—Complete Works, trans. from the critical ed. of P. Silverio de Santa Teresa and ed. E. Allison Peers. Vol. II: Spiritual Canticle. Poems. London:

Modern Language Notes

Volume LII

APRIL, 1937

Number 4

LA PRATIQUE ET LA THÉORIE DU RONDEAU ET DU RONDEL CHEZ THÉODORE DE BANVILLE

Comment Théodore de Banville a-t-il conçu le rondeau,¹ c'est ce que je me propose d'étudier ici; et, comme chez Banville la pratique précède la théorie, nous examinerons d'abord les poèmes qu'il a publiés sous les noms de *rondeau*, *rondel* et *triolet*.

Le numéro du *Journal de la librairie* du 22 octobre 1842 annonce les *Caratides*. Ce recueil contient deux rondeaux aabba, aabR, aabbaR, il s'y trouve aussi deux "rondeaux redoublés" et deux triolets.

Or, dans la *Revue des deux Mondes*² de 1841 avait paru un article de Sainte-Beuve sur Clotilde de Surville, où le critique réfutait l'opinion exprimée par Daunou sur l'attribution à Vanderbourg des œuvres de la "femme-poète du XV^e siècle."³ Sainte-

¹ Si le moyen âge paraît condamné définitivement par la double réforme de la Pléiade et de Malherbe, il serait faux, cependant, de croire que notre vieille littérature disparaît au XVI^e siècle pour n'être retirée de l'oubli que par des érudits du XVIII^e et du XIX^e siècle. La tradition médiévale subsiste à travers les âges classiques et ce que Chateaubriand remet en honneur d'une façon si éclatante, c'est un passé qui n'avait jamais été complètement oublié [H. Jacoubet, *Le comte de Tressan et les origines du genre troubadour*. (Paris, 1923)]. Mais, lorsqu'au XVI^e siècle on étudie le moyen âge poétique, on ne le comprend plus; on en est trop près et c'est ce voisinage même qui fait qu'on n'en distingue pas nettement les traits. Le XVII^e et le XVIII^e siècles connaissent le *genre marotique*, et ne passent guère "la frontière de Marot." C'est M. de Surville ou, plutôt, c'est le succès du *Tableau de la Poésie française au XVI^e siècle* (1828), de Sainte-Beuve aussi bien que celui des *Poésies de Clotilde de Surville* (publiées d'abord en 1803), qui accrédièrent le XV^e siècle auprès des romantiques et réhabilitèrent les *genres* romans.

² XXVIII (1841), 353.

³ Le *Journal des Débats* du 4 août 1839 nous informe que M. Daunou avait lu une notice sur la vie et les ouvrages de M. Vanderbourg.

Beuve nous dit que Surville a voulu faire croire à l'œuvre d'un "Charles d'Orléans femme."

En outre, le numéro du *Journal de la librairie* du 23 juillet 1842 fait part de la publication des poésies de Charles d'Orléans par J. Marie Guichard, et le numéro du 30 juillet de celle qu'a préparée A. Champollion-Figeac. Les œuvres de Charles d'Orléans avaient déjà été éditées en 1803, l'année même où paraissaient les poèmes de Clotilde de Surville.⁴

Il y a là une concordance de dates qui est curieuse. Banville s'est-il inspiré des rondeaux de Charles d'Orléans ou de ceux de Clotilde de Surville auxquels on s'intéressait de nouveau à cette époque? Parmi les poésies de Clotilde de Surville se trouvent des triolets (chacun d'eux a une seule strophe) et 17 rondeaux dont le moule est assez varié: 5 riment ababa, abaR, ababaR,—4 ont les rimes ababa, abaR, abbaaR,—2 riment: ababa, babR, baabbR;—2, ababa, abaR, abaabR;—2, abbaab, abaR, ababaR;—1, abbaab, abaR, babbaR; et un, abaab, abaR, babbaR.

Les rondeaux de Charles d'Orléans contenant 5 vers à la première strophe sont construits sur le schéma: AABba, aabAAB, aabbaA ou Aabba, aabA, aabbaA. Peut-on dire que le rondeau qui est remis en honneur par Banville, c'est moins celui de Charles d'Orléans que le genre marotique tel que l'ont pratiqué Voiture et La Fontaine? En outre, les "rondeaux redoublés" correspondent à celui de la Fontaine *Qu'un vain scrupule à ma flamme s'oppose*.

Dans les *Odes funambulesques* se trouvent des rondeaux du type aabba, aabR, aabbaR qui ont été composés de 1845 à 1855 et un rondeau composé en 1849 bâti sur le schéma ababa, bbaR, abaabR, très voisin d'un type qui se trouve chez Clotilde de Surville. Remarquons aussi que Musset composa plusieurs rondeaux: deux en 1842 dont le rythme est respectivement abbaab, abaR, ababaR et abaab, babR, ababbR, un en 1847 ababa, abaR, abbaaR, un en 1849 ababb, aabR, ababbR, et un en 1853 abbaab, abaR, babbR, dont deux types se remarquent chez Clotilde de Surville.

En 1875, paraissaient les *Rondels composés à la manière de Charles d'Orléans*. Dans la dédicace à Armand Silvestre, Théodore de Banville citait un couplet d'un *rondel* de Charles d'Orléans, *Le Temps a laissé son manteau*. Tous les rondels de Banville sont

⁴ F. Baldensperger, *Le mouvement des idées dans l'émigration française* (Paris, 1924) II, 166-170.

sur le même type ABba, abAB, abbaA, qui est le schéma suivi pour les rondeaux quatrains par les éditeurs de Charles d'Orléans, y compris Charles d'Héricault dont les *Poésies complètes de Charles d'Orléans* furent publiées en 1874. Banville avait aussi publié, outre les deux *triolet*s des *Cariatides*, 24 pièces du même genre (composées entre 1844 et 1859) et 8 encore, en 1868. Ces *triolet*s forment chacun une seule strophe, tandis que celui de Villon, *Jenin l'Avenu*, se lit en deux strophes jusque dans les éditions modernes.

Les éditions des œuvres de Charles d'Orléans et l'influence de Banville ont suscité des imitations nombreuses de ses *rondels*. M. Rollinat compose des *rondels* ABba, abAB, abbaA; L. Tailhade emploie le rythme ABab, abAB, babaA; M. Bouchor, pourtant, s'est servi du rentrement dans un rondeau abba, baR, abbaR.

Ne voit-on pas là la marque du crédit dont jouissait le prince-poète; n'est-ce pas le signe de la faveur qu'on accordait au rondeau remis à la mode au XIX^e siècle?

Si nous passons à la théorie, nous voyons que Banville est tout pénétré de Marot et surtout du marotisme de Voiture et de La Fontaine. Nous constatons aussi l'influence des publications nouvelles de Charles d'Orléans; mais il semble que Banville n'ait guère pénétré dans le XVI^e siècle et encore moins dans le XV^e; il fait de la poésie gothique, au goût du XVIII^e siècle,⁵ en ne comprenant pas mieux le moyen âge que ne le faisait la *Charles d'Orléans femme* dont Sainte-Beuve venait de s'occuper peu avant le moment où Banville publiait ses premiers poèmes.

En 1872, Théodore de Banville publia son *Petit traité de poésie française*; il s'inspirait du *Dictionnaire des rimes* de Napoléon Landais (Eugène de Massy) et L. Barré, publié en 1853, 59, 63,

⁵ Dans l'*Almanach des Muses*, on remarque plusieurs rondeaux et *triolet*s. En 1767 (p. 57), un rondeau du marquis de Saint Aubin, aabab, abaR, babaR;—en 1775 (p. 48) un rondeau d'un M. Mille, aabbababR, aabbaR;—en 1780 (pp. 27 et 177), deux *triolet*s de M. Davesne, en 1781 (p. 110) deux *triolet*s de M. de la Louptière, chacun formant une strophe;—en 1785 (p. 200), deux *triolet*s par M. Sauterau de Bellevand;—en 1787 (p. 24), une "Chanson imitée d'un de nos anciens poètes" par M. Legrand d'Aussy, et qui se présente sous la forme de deux strophes ABaabaB, abaabaB.

M. Marcel Bouchard parle aussi du genre marotique pratiqué par les érudits bourguignons du XVIII^e siècle et des rondeaux qu'ils composaient (*De l'humanisme à l'Encyclopédie*, Paris, 1930, p. 415).

72, de la *Versification française* de P. Richelet publié en 1671, 1677, 1751 et 1810, du *Traité de la poésie française* du Père Mourgues, plusieurs fois imprimé [le *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque Nationale* indique quatre éditions · 1697,⁶ 1724, 1729, 1754, Banville parle d'une "Nouvelle édition . . . chez Joseph Barbou . . .", (sans date)]. Il passe en revue les poèmes à forme fixe; c'est par le "rondel" qu'il commence. Il faut en chercher presque tous les chefs d'œuvre, nous dit-il, chez Charles d'Orléans. Il nous donne une définition du "rondel." C'est une pièce, nous assure-t-il, qui comporte trois strophes. la première est un quatrain ABba, la seconde un quatrain abAB, puis une "troisième strophe de six (*sic*) vers"; mais il semble qu'il y ait là une faute d'impression, car il nous indique que ce dernier couplet est formé d'un quatrain abba, "puis du vers qui commence le Rondel, ramené une troisième fois." Il cite la pièce de Charles d'Orléans, *Le temps a lassé*, telle qu'elle a été publiée par Champollion-Figeac et par Guichard, c'est-à-dire en trois strophes: ABba, abAB, abbaA.

Plus loin, vient le "rondeau" dont "le grand, l'unique maître . . . est Voiture," car "qui donc eût fait les Rondeaux les plus charmants du monde, si ce n'est celui qui avait le droit de les faire pour Mesdemoiselles de Bourbon, de Rambouillet, de Bouteville, de Brienne et du Vigan, et que remerciaient toutes ces lèvres de rose en fleur!" Les rondeaux de Voiture que Banville cite d'après l'édition de 1677 sont faits de trois strophes aabba, aabR, aabbaR, où R indique le premier ou les premiers mots du premier vers.

Pour le "rondeau redoublé," il cite une pièce de La Fontaine d'après l'édition de 1861 (les *Oeuvres* de La Fontaine avaient été publiées en 1819-21, 1822-23, 1826-27).

Le "triolet" est illustré par *Les Prunes* (1858) d'Alphonse Daudet. Le "triolet," nous dit Banville, "se compose de huit vers." Dans les traités de la même époque, on trouve à peu près la même distinction entre *triolet*, *rondel*, et *rondeau*. — F. de Gramont, (*Les Vers français et leur prosodie*, 1876) déclare qu'à l'origine, le rondel n'est qu'une chanson en deux couplets:

⁶ A la B. N. se trouve une "seconde édition, augmentée," publiée à Toulouse en 1697. Cet in-12 contient dans la III^e partie, chapitre 4, pp 245-254, 8 règles sur les rondeaux et triolets. On lit, dans ce traité, que "le refrain . . . n'est autre chose que la répétition du premier hémistiche" et qu' "il ne peut pas s'étendre au delà mais . . . pourrait ne pas le remplir" Ph. Martinon (*Les Strophes*, Paris, 1911), ainsi que Lanson, indique une édition en 1684.

Cette forme de la chanson persiste, en se régularisant dans les rondels de Charles d'Orléans . . . Ce sont toujours maintenant deux quatrains sur deux rimes. Les deux quatrains sont à rimes embrassées mais en ordre inverse. En dehors des deux quatrains se trouvent deux vers, un de chaque rime, lesquels commencent la pièce et y reviennent en refrain à la fin de chaque couplet.

Il cite la pièce de Charles d'Orléans, *Allez vous ant, allez, alés*, en disposant les vers de la façon suivante: ABbaabAB, abbaAB et il ajoute :

On divise quelquefois le premier couplet de ces rondels en deux quatrains, dont l'un commence et l'autre se termine par les deux vers de refrain. En cela on fait erreur . . . Si l'on devait faire une séparation, ce serait après les deux premiers vers, qui sont le motif proposé tant au poète qu'au musicien .

Il nous informe aussi que "dans Octavien de Saint-Gelais, le *rondel* est déjà presque le *rondeau*" Pour le *rondeau*, "il n'y a de répété que le premier vers seul et non plus deux," et "la pièce est formellement divisée en trois parties, savoir deux quatrains à rimes embrassées et disposées de même entre lesquels s'intercale un distique sur les deux rimes; après ce distique et à la fin du second quatrain se trouve répété le premier vers de la pièce." Quant au triolet, F. de Gramont remarque, après avoir cité un poème de Froissart, "la division en deux quatrains est ici complètement arbitraire." F. de Gramont indique pourtant—et cela est digne d'intérêt—que "les rondeaux triolets constituent la leçon primitive et comme l'embryon du rondel et du rondeau."

Becq de Fouquières (*Traité général de Versification Française*, Paris, 1879) examine les différents genres poétiques. Pour lui, le *triolet* "se compose de deux parties": ABaA, abAB,—le *rondel* se divise en trois parties ABba, abAB, abbaAB;—le *rondeau* est formé aussi de trois strophes, aabba, aabR, aabbaR où R est le refrain (premier mot ou premiers mots du premier vers). Le *rondeau redoublé* correspond au moule employé par La Fontaine.

On voit qu'il y a chez les théoriciens une grande incohérence. Ils ne remarquent pas nettement la relation qu'il y a entre le *triolet*, le *rondel* et le *rondeau*; aussi considèrent-ils parfois que le *triolet* ne se compose que d'une strophe ou de deux, que le *rondel* en a deux ou trois; il n'y a accord que pour le *rondeau*.

Il est curieux de voir, dans le *Petit traité de versification* de M. Grammont (4e édit., Paris, 1921), que le *triolet* se compose de huit

vers qui ne se divisent pas en strophes, que le *rondelet* "se divise en trois couplets de quatre vers, plus le refrain final; le premier et le dernier couplets sont à rimes embrassées et le deuxième à rimes croisées" (un poème de Charles d'Orléans est imprimé comme suit: ABba, abAB, abbaA). Le *rondeau* y est défini par les rimes aabba, aabR, aabbaR. C'est cette confusion dans la théorie qui fait que de nombreuses éditions coupent mal les vers des poètes du XV^e siècle. Je trouve, par exemple, dans les *Oeuvres* de Villon publiées par L. Dimier (Paris, 1927), que le *Rondeau d'amour déploré* n'a que deux strophes, W. F. Patterson (*Three Centuries of French Poetic Theory*, Ann Arbor, 1935, II, 136) publie ce même rondeau avec trois strophes disposées ainsi: abb, aabR, abbaR. Rien, non plus, ne semble justifier cette différence entre les "rondeaux" et les "rondelets" que font Banville, F. de Gramont, Becq de Fouquières et M. Grammont. Il est vrai que les premières formes du rondeau comprennent seulement deux ou trois vers, rarement quatre dans la première strophe, tandis que la deuxième n'a qu'un seul vers suivi du premier vers de la première strophe formant refrain, et que la troisième "compte autant de vers qu'il y en a dans la première strophe, le tout suivi de la répétition de cette première strophe tout entière formant refrain."⁷ Le rondeau auquel on donna plus tard le nom de *triolet* commence déjà à se distinguer au XIII^e siècle. C'est Eustache Deschamps qui donne le premier exemple d'un rondeau dont la première strophe comprend cinq vers. Chez Christine de Pisan, le refrain semble n'être formé que d'un vers; à la fin du XV^e siècle, au lieu du refrain on emploie le *rentrement*.

Ainsi, triolets, rondels, rondeaux sont un même genre qu'il semble qu'on doive diviser en trois couplets. D'autre part, les rondeaux simples d'Eustache Deschamps étaient composés comme suit: AB, aA, abAB, tandis que les rondeaux doubles l'étaient suivant le schéma ABAB, abAB, ababABAB. Dès Christine de Pisan, on rencontre souvent le type Abba, abA, abbaA.

Pourtant les éditeurs de Charles d'Orléans ont souvent donné à quelques-unes de ses poésies la forme ABba, abAB, abbaA. C'est encore ainsi, d'ailleurs, que fait souvent M. Pierre Champion (*Poésies de Charles d'Orléans*, Paris, 1927). Et cela s'explique d'autant plus facilement que les manuscrits n'indiquent jamais le

⁷ G. Raynaud, *Rondeaux et autres poésies du XV^e siècle*, Paris, 1889, p. xxxvii.

refrain tout entier. Seulement un mot suivi de *etc.* marquait le refrain, aussi l'éditeur moderne doit-il rétablir celui-ci d'après le sens, et on comprend combien il peut être difficile, parfois, de décider si l'auteur désirait un ou deux vers de refrain. En tout cas, il est remarquable que le refrain de beaucoup de rondeaux de Charles d'Orléans est formé de deux vers après la deuxième strophe dans les éditions anciennes et n'en a plus qu'un dans l'excellente édition de M. Champion. C'est, en particulier, le cas pour *Les fourriers d'Esté sont venus, Le Temps a laissé son manteau*, quoique M. Patterson (*op. cit.*, II, 131, 132) publie encore ces pièces avec un refrain de deux vers après la deuxième strophe.

Il semble bien que la plupart des rondeaux quatrains de Charles d'Orléans doivent être publiés suivant le schéma Abba, abA, abbaA, ou ABBA, abAB, abbaABBA. Il faut remarquer aussi que, dans le manuscrit même de Charles d'Orléans, il est fait une distinction entre les *rondeaux* et les *chansons*. Pour ces dernières pièces, le manuscrit indique les premiers mots des deux vers ou des trois vers de refrain après la deuxième strophe et seulement un mot du premier vers de refrain après la troisième strophe, ce qui donne un type proche du rondeau: ABba, abAB, abbaA et aussi AABba, aabAAB, aabbaA. C'est à ce premier type de chanson que Banville donnait le nom de *rondel*, réservant le nom de *rondeau* aux pièces aabba, aabR, aabbaR (où R est le *rentrement*), sur le type duquel Marot et surtout Voiture ont composé leurs *rondeaux*. Mais Villon, par exemple, avait déjà utilisé le type abba, abR, abbaR (Rondeau d'amour déploré.—Rondeau de la Prison) et Charles d'Orléans s'était servi du schéma Aabba, aabA, aabbaA, tandis que Marot a employé le moule, abba, abR, abbaR, et même une fois semble-t-il, Abba, abA, abbaR.

Conclusion: Banville ne se représentait pas le moyen âge sans quelque fantaisie; les définitions qu'il donne des triolets, rondels, rondeaux, rondeaux redoublés, ne correspondent pas à ce que ces genres littéraires ont été pour les poètes médiévaux. Doit-on voir, en son *Petit Traité*, "one of the notable monuments in the history and theory of French versification in the XIXth century" (M. Patterson, *op. cit.*, I, 224)? Ce que Banville a défini ce ne sont pas les *genres* du moyen âge, mais bien plutôt ce qu'il se représentait de ces poèmes à forme fixe. Banville se tournait beaucoup plus vers le XVII^e siècle que vers le XV^e. Les premiers rondeaux qu'il

compose appartiennent au type que Voiture avait remis en vogue. Il est important de remarquer, en effet, que dès 1820, on assiste à une série de rééditions des œuvres du grand siècle. L'intérêt qui se manifeste pour l'âge classique augmente le crédit des vieux genres qui avaient été réhabilités par Voiture et les poètes galants et précieux. C'est Voiture (dont les œuvres sont publiées en 1855, 1856, et qui le seront encore en 1879) qui, dit Titon du Tillet, "fit revivre les Ballades, les Rondeaux et les Triolets qui avaient été abandonnées depuis la réforme que Malherbe avait faite sur notre Parnasse, c'est lui qui fit revenir le goût qu'on avait perdu pour Marot."⁸ Les "rondeaux redoublés" que Banville publie en 1842 sont apparemment imités de La Fontaine et c'est encore un rondeau redoublé de La Fontaine que Banville cite comme exemple dans le *Petit Traité*. Il est vrai, pourtant, que Banville aurait pu s'inspirer de Marot dans l'œuvre de qui il aurait pu trouver les modèles de ces poèmes "romans."

A l'influence du XVII^e siècle il faut joindre, il est vrai, celle de Charles d'Orléans et de Villon. Mais c'est là un enthousiasme tardif. Banville ne compose ses rondels qu'après la triple publication des œuvres de Charles d'Orléans par Guichard, par Champollion-Figeac en 1842 et par Charles d'Héricault en 1874, et après la publication des œuvres de Villon par P. Jannet et 1867. C'est en 1875 que Banville écrit, dans son avant-propos aux *Rondels*: "c'est quelque chose peut-être que de tirer de l'oubli quelques-uns [des rythmes] que nos aïeux nous ont laissés en bloc, comme un tas de pierreries enfermées dans un coffre, que le féroce XVII^e siècle a failli jeter à l'eau avec tout ce qui était dedans, sans autre forme de procès." Pourtant, ce que Banville a connu du XV^e siècle, c'est surtout ce qui lui est parvenu à travers le "féroce" XVII^e siècle. Banville ne se rend peut-être pas bien compte que la tradition médiévale n'est jamais brisée et que les premières années du règne personnel de Louis XIV sont marquées par un renouveau de faveur pour la chevalerie et pour les "épicerie" qu'avait condamnées la Pléiade.

Cette distinction que Banville fait entre rondeaux, rondels et triolets semble, en effet, un héritage du XVII^e siècle.⁹ Miss Helen Louise Cohen¹⁰ nous dit qu'au moment où Voiture reprend le

⁸ H. Jacobet, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

⁹ Le P. Mourgues, pourtant, ne fait pas cette distinction

¹⁰ Helen Louise Cohen, *Lyric Forms From France*, New York, 1922, p. 63.

rondeau on ne reconnaissait aucune relation entre le triolet et le rondeau. Miss Cohen elle aussi semble ignorer que Marot a composé, en 1526, un "rondeau redoublé."¹¹ Nous sommes ainsi porté à nous demander si M. Pauphilet ne s'exagère pas "les méprisantes ignorances du XVII^e."¹² Je crois qu'en étudiant le XVII^e siècle de plus près, on trouvera de nombreux indices qui montreront l'influence du moyen âge sur le siècle de Louis XIV.

Cette étude nous a permis aussi de revoir les éditions de Charles d'Orléans et de Villon. Nous pensons que les éditeurs se sont quelquefois trompés quand ils ont publié les œuvres de ces poètes; ils ont mal coupé les rondeaux et ont mal imprimé les refrains. Nous avons vu aussi que les traités de versification française—sauf, pourtant, l'excellent ouvrage de Kastner¹³—ne donnent pas de notions très exactes des genres traditionnels à forme fixe que nous avons passés en revue. Dans son *Petit Traité*, Banville a fait œuvre de poète plutôt que de critique et d'historien.¹⁴

MARCEL FRANÇON

Harvard University

TWO NATURALISTIC VERSIONS OF GENESIS: ZOLA AND PARDO BAZÁN

In 1883 Emilia Pardo Bazán startled the Spanish world of letters with her book *La cuestión palpitante*. The "palpitating question" was that of French naturalism as preached by Emile Zola and his colleagues. The Spanish authoress found much to condemn and much to extol in the new literary system. Her personal admiration for Zola himself is great. Among the works of Zola which she singles out for special praise is *la Faute de l'abbé Mouret*. The quality she admires in this book is its "descriptive richness."¹ However, there is reason to believe she admired more than just its word pictures.

¹¹ "The rondeau redoublé . . . was devised by Jean de la Fontaine"

¹² A Pauphilet, "Le moyen âge et le romantisme." *Revue de l'Université de Lyon*, IV (1931), 147.

¹³ L. E. Kastner, *A History of French Versification*, (Oxford, 1903).

¹⁴ Italo Siciliano, *Dal Romanticismo al simbolismo*.—*Th. de Banville*, (Turin, 1927), p. 125. J. Reymond, *Albert Glatigny* (Paris, 1936), p. 323.

¹ Pardo Bazán, *La cuestión palpitante* (*Obras completas*, I, 213):

Although it is not at once apparent, there exists a close parallel in plot between *la Faute de l'abbé Mouret* (1875) and Pardo Bazán's *La madre naturaleza* (1887). Both novels are naturalistic versions of the old Bible story of Adam and Eve and the Serpent. Both stories present a modern Adam and Eve turned loose equally innocent in a modern Garden of Eden quite as wild and tempting as the original. In both the part of the Serpent is played by Mother Nature; and in both Nature, the Temptress, turns out to be a more sympathetic force than God, the Avenger, with his artificial standards of morality whereby the pair are judged and driven from their paradise. Since Zola was the first to think of writing Genesis according to naturalism, one cannot help but wonder whether Pardo Bazán's version does not owe something to his inspiration.

To Zola the reproductive act is artistically important. It symbolises the fecundity of life. As a naturalist, Zola rejects idealism, especially the idealism which considers virginity or celibacy to be virtues. Thus the Church, by its emphasis on these virtues of abstinence, becomes for Zola a negative force, symbolic of death, as opposed to life and fruitfulness, as sponsored by Mother Nature. So to Zola the voice of the Serpent in the Garden of Eden was merely the voice of Nature inducing the man and woman to fulfil the law of life and reproduce their kind. The Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil then becomes the Tree of Knowledge of the Facts of Life; and the avenging God becomes merely the futile negative force of false idealism which would cover the magnificent sexual act with shame and reproach.²

"Pasajes y trozos hay en sus libros que, según su género, pueden llamarse definitivos, y no creo temeraria aseveración la de que nadie irá mas allá. Los estragos del alcohol en el *Assommoir*, con aquel terrible epílogo del *delirium tremens*; la pintura de los mercados, en *El vientre de París*; la delicada primera parte de *Una página de amor*; el graciosísimo idilio de los amores de Silverio y Miette en *La fortuna de los Rougon*; el carácter del clérigo ambicioso en *La conquista de Plasans*; la riqueza descriptiva de *La falta del cura Mouret*, y otras mil bellezas que andan pródigamente sembradas por sus libros, son quizá insuperables. Con la manifestación de un poderoso entendimiento, de una mirada penetrante, firme, escrutadora, y a la vez con la copia de arabescos y filigranas primorosísimas, Zola suspende el ánimo."

* Cf. what Zola has his *raisonneur*, Sandoz, say in a discussion of his literary tenets in the novel, *l'Oeuvre*, 206: "et surtout l'acte sexuel,

In seeking to write his version of the Bible story, Zola ran into difficulties. In the first place, how could he discover two genuinely innocent persons in the modern world to play the parts of Adam and Eve? In the second place, where could he find a walled wilderness in France which would compare in luxuriousness of vegetation and isolation with the original earthly Paradise? And thirdly, how could he make God expel them from the Garden? It was a hard problem and Zola had to stretch probability seriously in order to accomplish its resolution. He remembered a large walled estate which he had known as a youth in the Midi. This he magnified in his imagination until it became of vast extent and alive with a vegetation worthy of sub-tropical regions. He pictured it as having been completely abandoned for years and scarcely visited even by the caretaker. Zola named the estate—quite appropriately—the *Paradou*. An Eve is found in the person of the overseer's innocent young daughter who has been allowed to grow up untutored and with free range of the Paradou since an early age. The problem of finding a suitable Adam is more difficult: where in France can Zola find a young man of Adam's appeal and innocence? . . . Serge Mouret was one of those young priests who go through the seminary in a mist of pure idealism, a man whose adolescent yearnings have all been turned into mysticism and devotion. Thrown into rude contact with a country parish, the struggle finally brings on an attack of brain fever. Serge has an eccentric uncle who is a doctor; this relative conceives the odd idea of putting his nephew in the Paradou to be cared for by the overseer's daughter. Serge awakes with his memory gone and nothing to remind him of the past. *Et voilà!* Here are our two necessary innocents in the necessary setting. The garden and the sun will do the rest. As Zola wrote in his *ébauche* when planning the book:

. Puis ils sont lâchés dans le parc, Ève et Adam s'éveillant *au printemps* dans le paradis terrestre. . . . C'est la nature qui joue le rôle du Satan de la Bible; c'est elle qui tente Serge et Blanche et qui les couche sous l'arbre du mal par une matinée splendide . . . Je calque le drame de

l'origine et l'achèvement continu du monde, tiré de la honte où on le cache, remis dans sa gloire, sous le soleil" N B. All quotations from Zola made in this article are from the annotated *Collection des œuvres complètes*, Paris, Imprimerie François Benouard, 1927.

la Bible, et, à la fin, je montre sans doute Frère Archangias apparaissant comme le dieu de la Bible, et chassant du paradis les deux amoureux.³

Zola succeeds very well in carrying out the biblical symbolism throughout the story. The lovers do not find the secret of life, the solution of their uneasiness, until one day the garden leads them to the sheltered sward beneath the giant *arbre du mal*. It is the tallest tree in the garden; its life is so abundant that its sides burst and creak, and the sap runs down on the ground all about the base of its great trunk. Zola exults in this symbol of fecundity. Then God appears in the person of Frère Archangias, a fanatical and woman-hating friar. The pair are ashamed and hide. But memory returns to Serge and he goes back to his parish. Paradise is lost never to be regained, but, contrary to the biblical story, the lovers are separated. They are parted by the artificial moral bonds of Serge's priestly vows.

We have seen Pardo Bazán's frank admiration for *La Faute de l'abbé Mouret* as expressed in *La cuestión palpitante*. Some years later when she conceived the idea of *La madre naturaleza* it seems apparent that she could not resist making a Spanish adaptation of Zola's idea. Pardo Bazán thoroughly digested the material in her source and has given us a story thoroughly Spanish and thoroughly Galician but nevertheless its debt to Zola appears obvious. As she was faced with the same three problems as the French author, let us see how she resolves them. In the first place what better Garden of Eden could one want than the wild hills of Galicia? Pardo Bazán did not have to draw on her imagination for them, she knew them. Now where to get an Adam and an Eve? She had them already prepared from the complicated happenings of her previous book, *Los Pazos de Ulloa*. There is Perucho, the illegitimate son of Don Pedro; there is Manuela, the legitimate but neglected daughter of his deceased wife. Now it is necessary, in order to modernize Genesis, as Zola did, to have some artificial reason exist, unknown to the lovers, whereby they cannot be married after their act but rather will be condemned by the laws of religion and not only cast out of Paradise but separated. This does not follow Genesis, where the pair continue united outside the walls, but it is the best Zola could do in a

³ This quotation from Zola's preliminary sketch or *ébauche* may be found in the notes at the back of *La Faute de l'abbé Mouret*, p. 418.

modern story to make the forces of morality condemn the fault and evict the lovers from Paradise. Pardo Bazán follows Zola's procedure rather than that of the Bible—the only variation being that she chooses a different moral barrier. Instead of her Adam being a priest who has lost his memory—a very unlikely situation—he is the illegitimate Perucho who has been kept ignorant of his true relationship to Manuela.

Thus the pair grow up together in the wilds, and, although ignorant of the fact they have a common father, they are nevertheless allowed to roam freely together like any bona fide brother and sister. It never occurs to Don Pedro that there might be a love affair some day between his son and daughter. The coming of Don Gabriel Pardo as suitor to Manuela precipitates Perucho's latent affection for the girl and one day they wander far afield through pleasant valleys and by running streams. Going ever farther into the wilderness, as if impelled by some mysterious force, they finally climb a mountain, upon whose bare and lonely summit there stands a great oak tree. Upon the natural bed beneath its friendly shade the lovers lie down, tired and pleasantly excited from their excursion. Mother Nature has led them to the *tree* and there they learn her secret. That night they are horrified to learn their true relationship. Manuela enters a convent and Perucho is sent to Madrid. Paradise is lost, never to be regained, and the lovers are *separated*, just as Serge and his sweetheart were.

That Pardo Bazán is conscious of her imitation is shown by the soliloquy of her *raisonneur*, Don Gabriel, when he is worrying about the two young people who have been wandering over the countryside all day; he says:

—Se me figura que la naturaleza se encara conmigo y me dice: Necio pon a una pareja linda, salida apenas de la adolescencia, sola, sin protección, sin enseñanza, vagando libremente, como Adán y Eva en los días paradisíacos, por el seno de un valle amenísimo, en la estación apasionada del año, entre flores que huelen bien, y alfombras de mullida hierba capaces de tentar a un santo. ¿Qué barrera, qué valla los divide? Una enteramente ilusoria, ideal; valla que mis leyes, únicas a que ellos se sujetan, no reconocen. . . .⁴

It is to be noted here that she tacitly compares the pleasant valley to Adam and Eve's Paradise and the two innocents to Adam

⁴ *La madre naturaleza* (Obras completas, IV, 283-4).

and Eve; moreover, it is an *illusory, ideal* barrier which separates them; the ideals of family purity and of priestly celibacy are not recognized by Nature's laws; furthermore, Nature admits being the *tempting force*, as she goes on to say to Don Gabriel:

. . . y yo, única madre y doctora de esa pareja, soy su cómplice también, porque la palabra que les susurro y el himno que les canto, son la verdadera palabra y el himno verdadero . . . y para entenderlo, simple, ¿qué falta hacen libros ni filosofías? ⁵

Compare now a few sentences from *La Faute* which parallel this passage very closely; here the garden (Nature) is frankly called the *tempter*:

C'était le jardin qui avait voulu la faute. Pendant des semaines, il s'était prêté au lent apprentissage de leur tendresse. Puis, au dernier jour, il venait de les conduire dans l'alcôve verte. Maintenant, il était le tentateur, dont toutes les voix enseignaient l'amour.⁶

Can there be any further doubt of the intimate relationship of these two novels? They are not merely writing Genesis-up-to-date; that is a common theme. They are writing a naturalistic Genesis in which Nature is admirable, while religion and God are artificial and over-idealistic. There is a marked parallelism of treatment; both have made the same alterations from Genesis; both have been hard put to it for a logical plot explanation for their babes in the wood; both have had to resort to a moral barrier unknown to the lovers in order to have them cast out of Paradise; both have left their lovers separated at the end, whereas Genesis does not. Certainly Pardo Banzán's story owes more to Zola than it does to Moses. As to whether the French or Spanish version is the better work from a literary point of view, who shall say? The adapter is often able to improve on his original.

DONALD F. BROWN

Missouri Valley College

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Zola. *la Faute de l'abbé Mouret*, 252.

LA FECHA DE *EJEMPLO DE CASADAS Y PRUEBA DE
LA PACIENCIA* DE LOPE DE VEGA

Nada se sabe sobre la fecha de la comedia de Lope de Vega *Ejemplo de casadas*, a no ser que fué publicada en el año 1615¹ y que no se menciona en *El peregrino*.

Una lectura cuidadosa de la loa que precede la comedia, y que debió haber sido escrita al representarse ésta, nos da ciertas vagas indicaciones sobre su fecha de composición.

Orillas de Manzanares,
entre fértiles cabañas,
donde el mayoral Helipe
su blanco ganado guarda;
hay tío mil novedades . . .
La hija del mayoral
dicen que agora se casa;
que otro mayoral muy rico
que vive en tierras extrañas,
le ha enviado un mensajero,
y ella, compuesta y galana
con sartaes y patenas,
cuentas y arillos de plata,
le recibió esotro día
entre otras muchas serranas;
y al mensajero polido
mil zagales acompañan . . .²

Lope menciona a continuación los nobles que asistieron a esta ceremonia, entre ellos a Juan el de Peñaranda y a "Juan Uceda, nueva planta de aquel ganadero rico, digno de eterna alabanza."³

A la cabaña llegaron
sin tamboriles ni flautas
por no alborotar la novia,

¹ *Flor de comedias de España de diferentes autores*, parte v, Alcalá, 1615, Barcelona, 1616. Chorley dice que "aunque no se mencione en *El peregrino* . . . fué escrita en el siglo xvi" (Rennert y Castro, *Vida de Lope de Vega*, Madrid, 1919, 478). Me imagino que se funda en "the use of old-fashioned royal octaves, a favorite strophe with the Juan de la Cueva school" (*MLN*, xxiv, No. 7, 199).

Aprovecho esta ocasión para hacer pública mi gratitud al señor H C Lancaster, cuyas sugerencias y activa cooperación han hecho posible este pequeño estudio.

² *Acad* xv, 3

³ *Ibid.*, 4.

que es, en efeto, muchacha . . .
 Quiso hablar, pero no pudo
 porque el angel que la guarda
 dió por ella el dulce fiat . .
Dicese que este verano
habra comedias y danzas,
 Esto hay nuevo en Manzanares.
 perdonad, tío las faltas.
Fecha a veintidós de abril,
primero día de Pascua
*que resucitó el Cordero . . .*⁴

Los versos "la hija del mayoral / dicen que agora se casa" sugieren inmediatamente cinco fechas posibles: 1585, año en que Felipe II casó a su hija menor, Catalina, con el duque de Saboya; 1593, año en que se trató de casar a la otra infanta, Clara Eugenia, con un noble francés, especialmente con el duque de Guisa;⁵ 1597, cuando Enrique IV, ya convertido al catolicismo, quiso tramitar su propio casamiento con dicha infanta;⁶ 1598, cuando Clara Eugenia se casó finalmente con el Archiduque de Austria; y 1612, año en que se negoció el casamiento de Ana de Austria, hija de Felipe III, con Luis XIII de Francia.⁷

Si combinamos esta información sobre los casamientos reales con los otros versos citados podremos descartar inmediatamente las primeras cuatro fechas. He aquí nuestras razones:

⁴ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁵ Este proyectado casamiento jugó papel importantísimo en las negociaciones de paz entre Francia y España. Empeñado en apoderarse del trono francés, primero por la fuerza y luego por la diplomacia, Felipe II propuso el matrimonio de su hija con un noble francés en cuatro ocasiones durante el año 1593. En primer lugar, él reclamó el trono francés para su hija, como nieta que era de Enrique II; en segundo lugar, él consintió en casarla con el archiduque Ernesto; luego transigió con que se casara con el príncipe francés que él escogiera, y finalmente, se decidió abiertamente por el duque de Guisa. Cf. Joseph Croze, *Les Guises, les Valois, et Philippe II*, Paris, 1886, 230, 231-32, 234, 240.

⁶ F. T. Perrens, *Les mariages espagnols sous le règne de Henry IV et la régence de Marie de Médicis (1602-1615)*, Paris (s. f.), 7-8, trae a cuento una intriga del rey francés para casarse con la princesa española que no merece ser discutida, pues, habiendo escogido al bribón Fouquet de la Varenne, como mensajero suyo, se ve, como dice Perrens, "l'intention de ne pas donner trop d'importance à des communications si suspectes."

⁷ Martha Walker Freer, *The Married Life of Anne of Austria, etc.*, N. Y., 1913, 1.

Ana Mauricia de Austria contaba once años no cumplidos cuando su padre la concedió en matrimonio al rey de Francia.⁸ De aquí que Lope diga que ella "es, en efeto, muchacha." Si Lope dice que todos los nobles "iban vestidos de prieto"⁹ a dicha ceremonia, ha de recordarse que a causa de la muerte de la reina doña Margarita, el 3 de octubre de 1611, toda la corte estaba aún de luto.¹⁰ Nótese que Lope dice que no hubo ni tamboriles ni flautas. Si como él refiere, "dícese que este verano habrá comedias y danzas," debemos tener en cuenta que los teatros habían sido cerrados a causa de la muerte de la reina.¹¹ El menciona al duque Peñaranda y al de Uceda, y estos títulos no fueron otorgados hasta 1609 y 1610, respectivamente.¹² Finalmente, y ésta es la prueba más fehaciente de que nuestra comedia se escribió en el 1612; "el día que resucitó el Cordero, primero de la Pascua" (para citar a Lope al revés), cayó el 22 de abril en 1612 solamente en el espacio de tiempo comprendido entre los años 1601 y 1684.¹³ De modo que si los negocios matrimoniales que Lope cita no pudieron haber sucedido antes de 1611, como las indicaciones anteriores muestran, éstos tienen que ser los ocurridos el 22 de abril de 1612 como el calendario religioso indica.

Ahora, para mayor comprobación, compárese la relación de Cabrera de Córdoba sobre los contratos matrimoniales que a continuación copiamos con la loa de Lope.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 4, 5.

⁹ *Acad.* xv, 4.

¹⁰ Luis Cabrera de Córdoba, *Relaciones de las cosas sucedidas en la corte de España desde 1599 hasta 1614*, Madrid, 1857, 468.

¹¹ Cf. H. A. Rennert, *The Spanish Stage*, N. Y., 1909, 220. Lope se había quejado ya en dos ocasiones sobre la ausencia de la comedia. En carta al duque de Sesa, fechada octubre 6-8, 1611, dice "Yo he despedido las musas por el ausencia de las comedias; falta me han de hacer, que al fin socorrian tanta enfermedad como mi casilla padece." Luego añade sobre el mismo asunto. "La comedia ha sentido esta desgracia; con debida abstinencia trátase ya de su resurrección por el bien de los hospitales." Rennert y Castro, *op. cit.*, 204.

¹² Cabrera de Córdoba, *op. cit.*, 394; y Juan Yáñez, *Memorias para la historia de don Felipe III, rey de España*, Madrid, 1723, 52. Dice el primero en relación fechada el 16 de enero de 1610. "Háse dicho que hacían gentiles-hombres de la Cámara, al duque de Cea, nieto del duque de Lerma, porque al padre, (don Cristóbal de Sandoval y Rojas) han dado título de duque de Uceda. . . ." Sobre Peñaranda, cf. *ibid.*, 349.

¹³ J. J. Bond, *Tables for verifying dates*, London, 1889, 138-9.

"de Madrid a 7 de abril de 1612

. . . El día de Nuestra Señora, a 25 del pasado, fué el embajador de Francia a besar las manos a S. M., y a la Infanta, y a la Infanta Reina de Francia, y el Príncipe, cuyo acompañamiento se encomendó al duque de Alba, el cual juntó todos los señores, títulos y caballeros de esta Corte, que le llevaron desde su casa a la del Embajador . . . (Este) pasó a besar la mano a la Infanta Reina de Francia, la cual se la dió y no le mandó cubrir ni le respondió a la norabuena que le dió, y S. M. respondió por ella, diciendo que se había turbado con la mucha gente que había, pero que le agradecía mucho lo que le había dicho, y estimaba lo que era razón tan buen vasallo como él era, el cual la trató de Magestad. . . . Aquella noche pusieron luminarias en las plazas y ventanas, sin haberse hecho otra demostración de regocijo, y por la mañana la Infanta Reina de Francia, en su cuarto había dado de comer y vestido a trece mugeres pobres, conforme la costumbre que tenía su madre en semejante día, y el siguiente se volvieron todos a poner el luto."¹⁴

Me parece que la semejanza de detalles entre esta relación y la loa de *Ejemplo de casadas* es tan exacta que podemos concluir sin temor a equivocarnos que la fecha de composición de dicha comedia es el 22 de abril de 1612.

J. H. ARJONA

Connecticut State College

THE NAÏVE THEME IN *THE TEMPEST* AS A LINK BETWEEN THOMAS SHADWELL AND RAMÓN DE LA CRUZ

It probably would have delighted Voltaire to know that Shakespeare was to tread the French stage first on the booths of the fair where Gilles, the clown, to whom he so often compared him, was wont to appear. For it has been shown that *Georget et Georgette*, a one-act *opéra-comique* given at the Foire Saint-Laurent on July 28, 1761, was probably the first French play containing Shakespearean material to be acted.¹ In fact, Scenes 5 and 6, which represent the first meeting of two innocents brought up in seclusion from the world, are plainly advertised to be "imitées d'une Pièce Anglaise intitulée: *La Tempête*."² Voltaire would have

¹⁴ Cabrera de Córdoba, *op. cit.*, 467-68.

¹ A. C. Keys, *Les Adaptations musicales de Shakespeare en France jusqu'en 1870* (Paris, 1933), pp. 17-22.

² Thus in the libretto (which I have used) found in the Library of

been further delighted to know that these scenes were not taken from the genuine Shakespeare (in his original impurity, as he would have considered it), but were adapted from the translation which the poet Destouches made in 1745 of several scenes of Shadwell's opera based upon the Davenant-Dryden version of *The Tempest*.³ But this is not the end of the career on foreign soil of this much adapted Shadwellian *Tempest*, as it is the purpose of this study to show the entry of this French version into the field of Spanish dramatic art.

It was Sir William Davenant, it will be recalled, who as Dryden's collaborator "designed the counterpart to Shakespeare's plot, namely that of a man who had never seen a Woman." It was he, too, who created a twin sister for Miranda, to provide a mate to this unsophisticated youth.⁴ The presence of such histrionic young innocents, which gives scope for several scenes of suggestive ingenuousness, was fairly common in plays of the Restoration period.⁵ As the awakening of the senses to the tender passion became one of the favorite themes of the theatre in France in the 18th century, we likewise find the subject appearing there with great frequency. Thus the plays of La Chaussée,⁶ Dancourt, Destouches,⁷ and many others are full of innocent young girls who babble frankly of love without knowing its significance. These French *ingénues*, however, while indulging in some equivokes, express themselves with much

Congress Cf also O. G. T. Sonneck, *Catalogue of Opera Librettos Printed before 1800* (Washington, 1914), I, 552.

³ Cf A C Keys, *ibid* The Davenant-Dryden *Tempest* was brought out at the Duke's House, Lincoln's Inn Fields, on November 7, 1667 Shadwell's opera, based on this version, was produced at Dorset Gardens, on or about April 30, 1674. Cf. Montague Summers, *Shakespeare Adaptations* (London, 1922), pp. xli-xlii.

⁴ Davenant's innovations are comprised in Shadwell's opera, which also retains most of the other features. In addition to Summers's work, quoted *supra*, cf. also Ernest Clarke, "'The Tempest' as an Opera," *Athenæum*, August 25, 1906, pp. 222-23, and W. J. Lawrence, "Did Thomas Shadwell write an Opera on 'The Tempest'?" in *The Elizabethan Playhouse and other Studies* (Philadelphia, Stratford-upon-Avon: 1922), pp. 191-206

⁵ Cf. Hazelton Spencer, *Shakespeare Improved* (Cambridge Harvard U. Press, 1927), pp. 201-202, Allardyce Nicoll, *Dryden as an Adapter of Shakespeare* (London, 1922), p. 17.

⁶ Cf. G. Lanson, *Nouvelle de la Chaussée* (Paris, 1903), pp. 252 ff.

⁷ Cf J Hankiss, *Philippe Néricault Destouches* (Debreczen, 1918), pp. 295 f.

more modesty and reserve than their English sisters. The type became particularly refined in the plays of Favart, the father of the French *opéra-comique*.

Though we know very little about Harni de Guerville,⁸ the author of *Georget et Georgette*, the fact that he collaborated with Mme Favart in writing *Les Amours de Bastien et Bastienne*, shows that his choice of this material was not a wholly haphazard matter. In fact, what could be more natural for him than to choose again a theme which had already met with success and was at the time the "rage" in Paris, as evidenced by the popularity which the Favarts and their stage innocents were enjoying? While Guerville found his material in Destouches's *Scènes Anglaises*, which are almost a word for word translation of the equivalent part of Shadwell's scenes, the manner of approach of the two authors is very important as indicative of their attitude. Gone from Guerville are all allusions and similes which make these innocents in the English play talk the language of the most profligate women, or of the most gay and dissolute roués:⁹ in their place we have naive utterances delicately painting nascent love, and terms born from an innocent heart rather than from licentious instinct.

This false bucolism, which exalts nature and country life, found its best expression in Spain in the *saynetes* that Ramón de la Cruz, the chief exponent of the *genre*, produced. As Cruz adapted several plays of Favart because of their depicting naïve love,¹⁰ he quite naturally fell upon Guerville's play when he needed material of the same kind, and on February 9, 1778, he produced *Juanito y Juanita*.¹¹ Cruz's adaptation adheres very closely to Guerville's original. Tomasa (Morosine), a widow, has decided never to make her daughter, Juanita (Georgette), see a man, as her husband had made her unhappy. Likewise, Jorge (Ursinus), a widower who had been disillusioned in his marriage, has brought up his

⁸ No mention of him is found in Michaud or in Hoefer. This author is likewise not mentioned in Keys's dissertation, quoted *supra*.

⁹ Cf. for example Prosper's speech in the *Œuvres de N. Destouches* (Paris. Lafèvre, 1911), v, 244, and Hypolite's speech, *ibid.*, 255.

¹⁰ Cf. A. Iacuzzi, *The European Vogue of Favart* (New York, 1932), pp. 305-315.

¹¹ Printed in *Colección de saynetes representados en los teatros de esta corte* (Madrid, 1792), Vol. II. Cf. also Emilio Cotarelo y Mori, *Don Ramón de la Cruz y sus obras* (Madrid, 1899), p. 360.

son, Juanito (Georget), in complete ignorance of women. However, when they discover that they are the parents of these innocents, their past matrimonial troubles seem suddenly to be forgotten, and they set out to make up for the time lost, for Jorge proposes to take Tomasa's daughter in marriage, while he offers her his son. This arrangement apparently suits her, for she accepts it at once, and they get ready to draw up the marriage contract, before the lord of the village should come to ask for Juanita's hand for Patricio (Lucas), a young villager, who has observed Tomasa's daughter. Their plans, however, are upset by the fact that Juanito and Juanita have managed to see each other and immediately fallen in love. Then follow the usual scenes of innocent prattle, after which, eventually, Juanito steals Juanita away from all the suitors and the two naive lovers are united in wedlock.

The Spanish *samete* is taken directly from the French *opéra-comique*. Cruz introduces only a minor innovation, in adding two suitors, Anton and Perico, to replace the single one, Lucas (Patricio), of the original. In some places the Spanish adaption is a mere translation of its French model. This is particularly the case in those scenes which Guerville took from Destouches's translation of Shadwell's *The Tempest*. Here are, for example, Georgette's words as she first appears on the scene (Sc. 5) :

Ah! Maman, dites-moi une chose? Nicole a toujours peur quand nous nous promenons dans le jardin. elle dit que l'homme pourroit bien monter par-dessus les murs. Est-il vrai?

And here is how Cruz puts it:

Juanita. No se me ponga enojada

mamá, y dígame una cosa.

Tomasa. ¿Y qué cosa es?

Juanita. Dice Olaya,

que es muy miedosa, que quando

salimos por las mañanas

a regar nuestro jardín,

por encima de las tapias

pudiera saltar el hombre

But, as the Spanish adheres closely to its French original, it follows its delicate tenor and omits the vulgarity of the Restoration piece. Instead of two lovers, who under the guise of innocence become devoid of all inhibitions and ladle out all sorts of innuendos

and double-entendres, we have two simple country folk who artlessly explain the sentiments they feel as love awakens in their hearts. It is interesting to note that, while Cruz knew the source of his *Hamleto* (1769), which he translated from Ducis,¹² he did not suspect, when drawing upon the French playlet, that he was rehandling material that through various adaptions traced its origin to the great English poet!

ALFRED IACUZZI

The College of the City of New York

A POSSIBLE SOURCE FOR E. A. BUTTI'S *CASTELLO DEL SOGNO*¹

The influence of Edgar Allan Poe in Italy seems to have been little studied as yet but that his work left traces in Italian literature is indubitable and one of the most striking proofs is the use made of *The Fall of the House of Usher* by the dramatist E. A. Butti in his *Castello del Sogno*.² That both authors have used the familiar buried-alive motif is apparent at once, but that Butti used Poe's story is unquestionable upon even a cursory examination. The debt to the American writer lies in the situation, the characters, the principal episode, and actual verbal echoes.

A disillusioned poet and man of the world, Fantasio, has withdrawn to a lonely mountain fastness with his young convent-bred sister, Ebe. They are not twins as in Poe. They live together with a physician, Logo, whose face, though very homely, is not sinister as is that of Poe's physician. In both authors the sisters are dying of strange maladies: Butti's heroine is languishing for want of normal life and love; the other has a disease which also baffles medicine, a wasting away with occasional attacks of cata-

¹² Cf. Ricardo Ruppert y Ujaravi, *Shakespeare en España* (Madrid, 1920), pp. 50-51.

¹ The texts used are E. A. Butti, *Castello del Sogno*, Milan, Treves, 1919 and the *Works of Edgar Allan Poe*, New York, Thomas Nelson and Sons, Vol. I.

² *Il Castello del Sogno* was first published by Treves in 1910, but was not staged till 1914. See L. Zuccoli, *Prefazione biografica to Intermezzo poetico, Il Frutto amaro, Vortice*, Milan, Treves, 1912, and *Annali del teatro italiano*, Vol. I, 1901-1920, Milan, Casa Editrice "L'Espresso," 1921, p. 156.

lepsy. The fourth personage in both stories is an old friend of the isolated man of the world. Fantasio resents the arrival of this intruder from the outside, but is courteous in receiving him. Usher is, however, glad to have the companionship of his friend.

Butti eschews the old manor house for a medieval castle which may easily have been suggested by the lyric in this same story entitled "The Haunted Palace." In this symbolic poem a mysterious monarch rules happily in a strange palace till assailed by sorrow and destruction. So Fantasio rules in absolute supremacy over his small world until deserted by his sister, her lover and all his followers save Logo and a drunken servant. The Italian play closes precisely as this lyric does with the out-rushing of the inhabitants of the castle:

And travellers now within that valley,
Through the red-litten windows see
Vast forms that move fantastically
To a discordant melody,
While, like a rapid ghastly river,
Through the pale door,
A hideous throng rush out forever,
And laugh—but smile no more

The "hideous" throng of Poe resolves itself into a motley crowd rendered fantastic by the description of various Orientals; and the "discordant melody" is replaced by the *Marseillaise*, which calls these people out of their solitude back to active life in the wake of Napoleon.

The most striking similarity is, of course, that of the burying alive of Madeleine and Ebe. Here even verbal likenesses are frequent. When Fantasio, having imprisoned Angelo, his friend, because he is jealous of Angelo's love for his sister, tells Ebe Angelo is dead, the shock deprives her of every sign of life and she is buried with pomp in a tomb situated just under the room in which Angelo is detained. Angelo is not, as Usher's friend, present at the ceremony, but learns of it from a servant and from Fantasio himself, who comes in grief to his friend. The tomb in which the Italian heroine is placed is reminiscent of Poe's "vault sheathed with copper."

Si, sotto questa torre, nella dura
roccia, s'apre una vasta critta dalle
pareti di metallo, a cui s'accede
per un lungo ambulacro sotterraneo,
anch' esso foderato di lamiera. (Act IV)

Although Poe does not expressly mention a corridor, he speaks of the woman's struggles within the "coppered archway of the vault" and this may have suggested the "ambulacro" to Butti. The night of the episode is strange in both stories. It is sternly beautiful in Poe, without moon, stars or lightning:

But the under surface of the huge masses of agitated vapor, as well as all the terrestrial objects immediately around us, were glowing in the unnatural light of a faintly luminous and distinctly visible gaseous exhalation which hung about and enshrouded the mansion (P. 174)

Butti's mysterious light is similar:

Un torbido chiarore,
come di mille torce fumiganti,
la stessa luce che avviluppa nella
critta la salma idolatrata, illumina
anche la valle. (Act IV)

Angelo explains the light as "una meteora luminosa" or perhaps a brush fire while Usher's friend suggests not uncommon electrical phenomena or the "rank miasma of the tarn" as an explanation, and drags Usher away from the window. Angelo also drags Fantasio away from the strange sight.

Both Usher and Fantasio express their fear that their sisters have been buried alive and here Butti uses much the same words as Poe but with more elaboration, and, at the close of their lurid descriptions of the probable agony of the buried, each brother exclaims with dramatic effect:

Madman! I tell you that she now stands without the door! (P. 180)

Insensato!
Io ti dico in questo instante mia
sorella è dietro quella porta! (Act IV)

In fact, when the door is opened, there stands the risen dead, dressed in white and stained with blood. In Poe's tale she falls upon her brother and bears him to the ground, a corpse. The situation is more cheerfully romantic in Butti's play, for Ebe falls into the arms of her lover and is borne away to life and happiness.

There can be little doubt that in this instance Butti deserted Ibsen for Poe, combining with the situation, characters and main episode found in Poe, a rather vague philosophical theme, echoes of the French Revolution and the coming of Napoleon.

H. L. NORMAN

ST. JEROME AND THE FIRST TERZINA OF THE
DIVINE COMEDY

Baldassare Lombardi's widely known commentary of the *Divine Comedy*,¹ many times reprinted² and held in high esteem during more than a century,³ sees in the first terzina of the *Inferno* an allusion to Isaiah xxxviii, 10: "Ego dixi: in dimidio dierum meorum vadam ad portas inferi." This parallel, embracing the central theme of the poem, has been endorsed by many another commentator, e. g. E. Camerini,⁴ A. Kopisch,⁵ and G. A. Scartazzini,⁶ and has become part of the standard stock of *Dantologia*. So far as it has been possible to ascertain, however, none of the innumerable exegetes has chanced upon a paraphrase of Isaiah's text by St. Jerome which comes closer to the wording of Dante's first two lines than the scriptural passage itself. It is a well-known fact that even though St. Jerome was not among his favorites,⁷ Dante was familiar enough⁸ with the works of the *Maximus Doctor Ecclesiae*.⁹ The passage in question is found in Jerome's *Commentarius in Isaiam Prophetam* xi, 38.¹⁰ "In medio vitae cursu, et in errorum tenebris ducentur ad Tartarum." The much-interpreted *nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita* appears to be a close transliteration

¹ *La Divina Commedia, nuovamente corretta, spiegata e difesa* da F. B. L. M. C., Roma, Fulgoni, 1791.

² G. Mambelli, *Gli Annali delle edizioni dantesche*, Bologna, Zanichelli, 1931.

³ G. A. Scartazzini, *Dantologia*, 3rd ed. by N. Scarano, Milano, Hoepli, 1906, p. 237.

⁴ *La Divina Commedia di Dante Alighieri*, per cura di E. Camerini, Milano, Sonzogno, since 1868-69 many editions.

⁵ *Die göttliche Komödie des Dante Alighieri*, metrische Uebersetzung mit Erläuterungen von August Kopisch, Berlin, 1842.

⁶ *Enciclopedia Dantesca*, Milano, Hoepli, 1898, II, 1244; cf. also his edition of the *Divine Comedy*, frequently reprinted since 1893.

⁷ On St. Jerome and Dante, cf. Paget Toynbee, *A Dictionary of Proper Names and Notable Matters in the Works of Dante*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1898, p. 324.

⁸ E. Moore, *Studies in Dante*, First Series, Oxford, Clarendon, 1896, p. 60.

⁹ F. W. Farrar, *Lives of the Fathers*, New York, Macmillan, 1889, II, 296.

¹⁰ Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, xxiv, 407 B.

tion of Jerome's *in medio vitae cursu*, and the immediately following *in errorum tenebris* manifestly corresponds to the *selva oscura* of the second line. Thus, the Hieronymic passage confirms the interpretation laid on the "forest" as "the social influences which darken a man's perception of the truth, and prevent him from seeing the right path."¹¹

ABRAHAM STEINER

Hunter College

PASSAGES FROM THE ANGLO-NORMAN BOOK OF KINGS

One of the items in lot 468 of the Sotheby & Co. sale of July 24, 1935, was an Anglo-Norman fragment (now in my possession) of the twelfth-century *Quatre Livres des Reis*.¹ Aside from the basic manuscript *M* (Bibliothèque Mazarine, 54) which was chosen for the Curtius edition, the Sotheby fragment is the only known text in the dialect attributed to the original. Furthermore, except for *M*, it is perhaps older than any extant manuscript of the *Quatre Livres des Reis*. The present aspect of the fragment suggests that it may at one time have formed part of a binding. Prior to its appearance at Sotheby's, it had been in England earlier and had subsequently passed through the hands of E. von Scherling, Leyden bookseller and publisher of the catalogue-bulletin *Rotulus*.² No further information as to the fragment's previous history has been available to me. Torn on one side and cut with scissors on the other three, it measures roughly 15 x 7 cms. In addition to the 26 lines of text preserved on each side of the vellum remnant, there are indications that the lost pages of the manuscript were double-

¹¹ H. F. Tozer, *Dante, La Divina Commedia, Notes on Inferno*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1902, p. 2.

¹ Edited by E. R. Curtius, *Gesellschaft für Romanische Literatur*, xxvi (Dresden, 1911). Cf. A. Stimming, *ZRPh.*, xxxvi (1912), 743-48; J. Vising, *Kritischer Jahresbericht*, xiii (1913), 244¹, and 87-88²; J. Bonnard, *id.*, xiii, 68-70².

² Cf. I, 18 (February, 1931): "1102a. An exceedingly rare fragment of the first Bible translation, very early 13th century, 53 (sic) complete lines, 2 pages on vellum (6.3 inches) (*Li quatre Livres des Rois*). Unrecorded fragment" Mnr. von Scherling has supplied me with the additional fact that he discovered the *Livres des Reis* passages among "a large collection of manuscript fragments coming from England."

columned. Parts of columns *a* and *d* are all that remain; comparison of the Curtius edition with the lacuna between the two parts of the fragment shows that the original columns of the manuscript contained about 35 lines each, and that each column measured 2 cms. by approximately 17.5.

The Anglo-Norman origin of the fragment is not open to question, despite the brevity of its two passages. The following traits, considered collectively, point to this conclusion: use of *u* for *o* or *ou* (*lur*, *ure*, *ruge*); *ei* in *meins*, *fontemes*, *veneient*, *rei*; intercalated *e* (*beverez*, *liverat*, *coverez*); use of *k* and *w* (*ki*, *ke*, *ewe*); final *d* or *t* in *ad*, *apelat*, *levat*, *od*; pretonic *ui* (< *oi*) reduced to *u* in *conussance* and pretonic *ei* to *i* in *aparillerent*; *ceo* for *ço*; continental pretonic *e* replaced by *o* in *bosom*; effacement of pre-consonantal *s* in the imperfect subjunctive *apelat*; *me* for feminine *ma*.

The first passage in the fragment corresponds to page 178, lines 1-15, in the Curtius edition, and to iv *Regum*, iii, 17-23. The second passage parallels the edition from 179, 23 to 180, 4, and corresponds to iv *Regum*, iv, 11-17. The absence of manuscript variants from the edition removes any immediate possibility of classifying the fragment in the stemma postulated by Curtius. Collation of the fragment (cf. below) with his text shows, however, that manuscript *M* is somewhat superior. Further comparison with the Vulgate as well points to the greater authenticity of *M* in the transmission of iv *Regum*, iv, verses 14 (. . . *quid ergo vult ut faciam ei* . . .) and 16 (. . . *domine mi, vir Dei* . . .). As a significant link in the Anglo-Norman history of the *Quatre Livres des Reis*, the text of the fragment is given in full. Wherever it diverges in any significant respect from the edition, the reading accepted by Curtius is noted in italics between parentheses.

I

“ . . . cist chanelz ert replenis d'ewe (*de éve*), e vus en beverez e li oz e vos bestes ” E ce (*çó*) li est poi a nostre Seignor, mes il vus liverat Moab as meus. E totes lur citez e lur fermetez prendrez e destruirez e toz les arbres ke (*ki*) fruit portent coperez e totes lor fontaines estuperez e toz lur champs de pieres coverez. Le matin a l'ure ke l'en deust sacrifier (*l'um soleit faire sacrefise*), este vus ewes grandes ke (*ki*) veneient devers Edom come de cretines, sin orent grant planté e ces (*o halte p. tocs*) de l'ost. Cil de Moab sorent ke li trei rei veneient sor els a ost. Pur ceo s'assemblerent e aparillerent toz cels ki defensable estoient. Si se tindrent en

(a) lur marches e atendirent lur enemis. Par matin, cum li soleilz levat, li rais du soleil ferit (*f. enz*) en l'ewe, si aparut (*parut*) l'ewe par le soleil ruge come sanc. E cil de Moab penserent ke l'ewe fu ensenglanté (*l'éve fust ensanglantée é rûge de sanc*). E distrent entre sei 'Li reis ke nus sorveneient (*ki sur nus venéient*). . . .'

II

. ke li prophetes i vient (*vint*) e jut en cele chambre. Si apela Giezi, son serjant (*servant*), si li dist: 'Apelez (*Apele*) mei la dame.' Cil l'apelat, e ele (*l'a. si vint*) devant le prophete. E il comanda a Giezi (*c G*) ke ces paroles li deist. 'Tu m'as servi (*servie*) soverement e (*e ententivement*) que vels ke jo te face? As tu nul bosoun a fere ke jo parole pur tei al rei ou al conestable de la chevalerie?' Cele respondi. 'Jo main mult bien e a suefté (*suertered*)³ entre mes amis e od me (*ma*) conussance.' Respondi li prophetes: 'E que vels tu (*que volt*) dunc ke jo te (*la*) face?' Respondi Giezi: 'Ne l'estuet pas demander; ele n'ad nul fiz, e sis mariz est veillarz.' Lores comandat ke il l'apelat (*l'apelast*), e ele vint jesk'a (*jésque a*) l'hus. E li prophetes li dist 'En tens (*t é*) a cest oure, si jo vif, tu erz enceinte d'un (*de un*) fiz' Cele respondi: 'Nule rien, beau sire (*Nú faire, bel sire, huen Deu*), ne me di fors si cum il ert.'

CUM GIEZI OUT ENFANT E MURUT E PUIS REVINT⁴

La parole al prophete averat, kar ele conceut e . . .

EDWARD B. HAM

Yale University

ESPREC IN LE JEU DE LA FEUILLÉE

Verse 468 of *Le Jeu de la Feuillée* presents one of those trying puzzles bequeathed to modern editors by some inattentive mediæval Adam Scrivener: a hapax legomenon without kindred or affinity. The dialogue in the play has turned upon the Pope's severity in dispossessing the *clercs bigames* of a certain tax exemption. Gillot says, v. 457, that one clerk, Plumus, "has boasted that if his clerkly learning doesn't fail him, he will get back what was taken away from him at the cost of a measure of tow. It is a lucky thing for the pope guilty of it that he is dead; had he been never so strong and mighty, he (Plumus) would have deposed him,"—and he goes on:

³ *Suerted* is the reading of manuscript *M* as recorded by Curtius in a note (p. 179).

⁴ The following marginal note in the Curtius edition (p. 180) corresponds vaguely to this rubric: *Oume li enfes murut*.

Mal li eust onques osé
 Tolir privilege de clerc,
 Car il li eust dit esprec,
 Et si eust fait l'escarbote

Langlois¹ notes in his glossary that Godefroy does not register *esprec*, and he himself puts a question mark after the word. He cites from Van Hamel's introduction to the *Matheolus* the remark of Eudes de Cheriton that worldly-minded clerks were nicknamed *escarbots*.

A study of the mediaeval texts in which the *escarbote* figures does indeed disclose that in the XIIIth century the *escarbote* (*scarbo*) in homily and apologue symbolised the fleshly-minded clerk. The hankerings of the flesh are similarly represented by the *stercus*, the *sterquilinium*, which the *scarbo* haunts and forever craves. Our own passage from the *Jeu de la Feuillée* dates from 1276, or perhaps a year later, but in any case from a time when the discussions aroused by the decrees of the Council of Lyons were still warm and high. It was because *escarbotes* were everywhere in the Church that the Council had been summoned. At such a time the epithet would be freely used and universally understood. *Faire l'escarbote* would bring up the picture of the dung-beetle at his nasty work, and it would suggest the clerk in name and office who lived immersed in carnal and worldly preoccupations.

If now we examine anew the verses of the *Jeu de la Feuillée* we observe that *esprec* is obviously corrupt. It fails to rhyme with *clerc*.² *Esperc* would be no clearer. But the habits of the *escarbote* and the regular association in Latin texts of *scarbo*, *sterquilinium*, and *stercus* suggest that the word miscopied is *esterc* from *stercus*. It would be, like *esprec*, a hapax legomenon, but it rhymes with *clerc* and it is pertinent to the context.

Gillot, who is a person of some education, may well have coined such a word as *esterc* facetiously. *Scarbo* and *stercus* are inseparable. *Esterc*, clearly, fits the situation if we accept the equivalence of *scarbo* and worldly-minded clerk, of *stercus* and worldly-

¹ Adam le Bossu, *Le Jeu de la Feuillée*, édité par. L. Langlois, Paris, 1923

² That should suffice to condemn it. Adam de la Halle nowhere else in the play takes such a liberty with rhyme. The only imperfect rhyme occurs in vv. 527-528, which show *dit-prist*.

mindedness. "Never," says Gillot, "would the Pope have dared to take his (Plumus's) clerkly privileges away from him, for Plumus would have said "Esterc!" to him, and thus surely have played the *escarbote*." The *escarbotes* could appropriately make "Esterc!" their battle-cry. And Plumus, after uttering this horrific Rabelaisian challenge, "would in truth have shown himself an *escarbote*."

The article by Professor Holmes in the January number of *MLN.* on Villon's verse, "Plus enflée qu'un vlmeux escharbot," makes it possible to specify what Plumus's action would have been. The characteristic explosive discharge by the *escarbote*, or bombardier beetle, would lend to *faire l'escarbote* the additional sense of *pedere*. Our text would accordingly have expressed the double thought. "He would have played the *escarbote* indeed, and discharged a *peditum*."

H. Loss

Carleton College

PROVENÇAL *huelh de veire* AND *sec . . . son agre*

There is a brief Provençal bestiary, known as "Aiso son las naturas d'alcus auzels e d'alcunas bestias," which is available in both the Appel and Bartsch-Koschwitz chrestomathies.¹ Among the birds is the *huelh de veire* or 'bird that sees as through glass' whose marvellous power provokes many a laugh at the naivety of the medieval mind. This is the description: "Huelh de veire es un petitet auzel blanc e vert, et a la pus sotil vista que res que sia, que be veiria tras un paret." The bird in question must be the wood warbler (or wood wren) for which the French name today is *pouillot siffleur*.² This bird is very small, only five and a quarter inches long; it is greenish on the back and white with some yellow underneath. It "frequents high trees," then "hovers to pick food from under leaves, then back to perch."³ It is my belief that this habit of hovering over a leaf and seeming to perceive insects underneath gave rise to the belief that it could see through solid material. If this be true our laugh should not be quite so loud next time.

¹ Pp. 201-4 in Appel; cols. 359-64 in the Bartsch-Koschwitz.

² Paul Paris, *Les oiseaux d'Europe* (Paris: Laveur, 1906), p. 57. This is the *Phyllopeuste sibilatrix* or *Phylloscopus* of scientific terminology.

³ I am quoting from E. Sandars, *Bird Book* (Oxford Press, 1933), p. 26.

In this same bestiary is the *colom* or 'dove,' which *sec trop volun- tier son agre per paor d'auzel de cassa*.⁴ Appel suggests reading *set* (= *sez*) *t. v. sobre aiga* but with a question mark. However, it is quite true that the European rock dove "never lights on trees. Drinks freely, sometimes alighting on water,"⁵ and in this practice it is somewhat unique among others of its kind. I see no reason, therefore, for Appel's question mark.

URBAN T. HOLMES

University of North Carolina

FRENCH AND ENGLISH ECHOES OF A DESCRIPTIVE PASSAGE IN TASSO

In the *Gerusalemme liberata*, xv, 55-56, two warriors, searching for Rinaldo in the garden of Armida, come upon a fountain in whose waters some sirens are refreshing themselves. Tasso depicts the nakedness of the swimmers in the true style of the Rinascimento and adds "E'l lago all'altre membra era un bel velo." He describes the eyes of one of the bathers and pictures her hair as "raccolto in un sol nodo" (61). When she leaves the water, she is worthy of comparison with a goddess:

. . . o come fuore
Spunto nascendo già dalle feconde
Spume dell'Ocean la Dea d'Amore.

La Calprenède reproduces a similar situation and scene in his *Faramond*, v, 86-88. A warrior chances to interrupt a beautiful maiden who is bathing in the Main. After noting carefully the qualities of her beauty, the novelist adds, "C'estoit tout ce qui me paroïssoit alors, les eaux envieuses me cachoient le reste." He describes her eyes. Her hair is partially tied up with "une petite coiffe de gaze." La Calprenède then concludes with the same reference: "un pied bien plus beau que celui qu'Homere donne à Thetis." Nathaniel Lee, drawing the material for his *Theodosius or the Force of Love* from the translation of *Faramond* by J.

⁴ This is found only in the version published by Appel; it is not in the Bartsch-Koschwitz. Appel's query is in the note.

⁵ Sandars, *ibid.*, p. 222; Paul Paris, *ibid.*, p. 77. This is the Columba Livia.

Phillips, includes an almost identical scene in Act I, ll. 171-210, where Theodosius describes to Atticus the circumstances surrounding his seeing Athenais for the first time.¹ The Emperor, by chance, passes a stream where he hears two charming voices. He comes upon a woman who is bathing. Like Tasso and La Calprenède, Lee depicts her "naked glory" and yet remains within the bounds of absolute propriety by adding that "down to her knees, the nymph was wrapped in lawn" (l. 197). Her beauty calls for comparison with the Goddess of Love:

Not sea-born Venus, in the courts beneath,
When the green nymphs first kis'd her coral lips,
All polisht, fair and washed with Orient beauty,
Could in my dazling fancy match her brightness (ll 185-8).

SPIRE PITOU, JR.

Georgia School of Technology

NOTE ON A LETTER BY FONTENELLE

Sometime before 1712¹ Fontenelle wrote a long letter "sur la resurrection" to the Marquis de La Fare. This letter has never been printed in the works of Fontenelle and although it has had two separate editions,² there is but one known copy of them in

¹ Fritz Resa, *Nathaniel Lees Trauerspiel Theodosius*, Berlin, Felber, 1904, points out Lee's debt to that portion of the novel devoted to the story of Athenais, Theodosius, and Varanès, but he does not mention that this passage, taken from the story of Viridomare, is copied almost directly from *Faramond*. Thus, it can now be said with certainty that Lee was familiar with more of the novel than only those pages devoted to the Athenais-Theodosius-Varanès triangle. That the same passage in Tasso was subsequently used by Chateaubriand has already been pointed out by Gilbert Chinard, *Les Natchez de Chateaubriand*, Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1932, p. 329. Cf. also Chandler Beall, *Chateaubriand et le Tasse*, *ibid.*, 1934, p. 56.

² The Marquis de La Fare, to whom the letter is addressed, died in 1712.

² (1) In 1807, 60 copies only, printed by Doctor Thomassin of Besançon on his private press, with a supplement. (2) According to Brunet (*Manuel*, II, col. 1333) this was reprinted, without the supplement, viz.: *En Europe*. 1819, pet. in -8 de 5 feuillets tirés à 50 exemplaires. Gabriel Peignot reprinted (1807, an edition of 94 copies only) the *Relation de l'Île de Bornéo*

existence.³ But there is a manuscript copy of the letter, made prior to 1758, at the Bibliothèque Nationale.⁴ This copy has some forty variants differing from the printed letter, and in all cases they are preferable, in lucidity and in grammar, to Thomassin's version. One or two of them seem to be worth calling attention to since they throw some light on Fontenelle's choice of reading-matter, as well as revealing the strange behavior of Dr. Thomassin in omitting them.

Near the end of Thomassin's edition we read: "*Le marquis de Roquelaure aura un nez, et Monseigneur le duc d'Estrées (sic) n'en aura qu'un.*" Jamet's copy reads: "*Là, M. de Roquelaure pourra aller à la foire des nez s'en choisir un qui plaise aux femmes, et M. le duc d'Estrées n'en aura plus qu'un.*" This Roquelaure is doubtless Gaston-Jean-Baptiste (1614-1683), called "the homeliest man in France," and Estrée is probably Victor-Marie (1660-1737). As for the "foire des nez," that comes from Rabelais, Book I, ch. 40. At the end of the letter, Thomassin reads: "*Je m'informerai de leur⁵ sort au premier long entretien que j'aurai avec mon génie; mais . . .*" Jamet: "*Je m'informerai de leur sort au premier long entretien que j'aurai avec mon génie, frère de celui du comte de Gabalis; mais . . .*" *Le Comte de Gabalis* (Paris, 1670, in -12) is a book by Montfaucon de Villars and its second part is entitled: *les Génies assistants et les Gnômes irréconciliables*. It is a satirical, esoteric book that brought down the burning wrath of the Church upon its author.

The letter itself is of no great importance except to show excellently well the scientific-witty-benevolent nature of Fontenelle, his presaging the doctrines of the conservation of energy, and his ideas on a future life that coincide on some major points with those held by certain modern religious denominations.

The Principia College, Elsah, Illinois

ROBERT E. PIKE

by Fontenelle, to a few copies of which was appended the letter printed by Thomassin, but so far as I know all these copies have disappeared, as well as all of the edition of 1819. At least none are to be found in the libraries of Paris and London.

³ BN, Rés. D. 61606 (Thomassin's edition)

⁴ Nouv acq fr. 4364, pp. 26-29 This volume is a strange collection, written or compiled by the bibliophile F.-L. Jamet (1710-1768).

⁵ i e, of women in the next world.

UNE SOURCE DU *ZADIG* DE VOLTAIRE

L'édition annotée de *Zadig* faite par les soins de M. G. Ascoli est excellente et ce n'est que le hasard des lectures qui me permet de suggérer la source d'un épisode mal expliqué de ce roman.

On se rappelle que *Zadig*¹ avait composé des vers improvisés sur une tablette et que l'ayant brisée en deux il en avait jeté les morceaux dans les buissons. Or l'Envieux en retrouva un seul dont les vers incomplets étaient une injure au roi. *Zadig* fut emprisonné.

Il est évident tout d'abord que Voltaire voulait montrer par là comment un écrivain innocent pouvait être injustement mis en prison à cause de ses écrits. Mais la chose en elle-même était trop commune pour ne pas croire que Voltaire ait songé à un cas historique précis. Au 17^e siècle les hommes brûlés pour leurs livres commençaient à se faire rares.² L'un des derniers, Claude Le Petit, auteur du *Paris Ridicule*, fut condamné au bûcher en 1662.³ Bien qu'on ne sache pas exactement de quelle manière il fut incriminé, il circulait sur sa condamnation une légende fort accréditée et souvent répétée.⁴ On racontait que le vent avait, par une fenêtre ouverte, emporté quelques brouillons des poésies de Le Petit et qu'ils étaient tombés sur un prêtre qui passait dans la rue. Celui-ci n'aurait eu rien de plus pressé que de dénoncer l'auteur à la censure. Notons la ressemblance des deux épisodes et surtout l'intervention d'un prêtre, la bête noire de Voltaire.

Voltaire connaissait-il cette légende? On peut le supposer car non seulement il connaissait bien le "siècle de Louis XIV," il devait encore porter un intérêt tout particulier aux hommes condamnés pour leurs écrits. Mais nous avons une indication plus précise qui rend presque certaine notre hypothèse que Voltaire, en écrivant le chapitre de l'Envieux, s'est servi de cet épisode. On sait quel intérêt il portait à Boileau. Or dans l'édition de ses œuvres de 1745 (*Zadig* est de 1747) le commentaire de quelques

¹ Chapitre IV, "L'Envieux."

² Voir Mac Pherson, H. D. *Censorship under Louis XIV*, New York. Inst. Fr. Stud 1929, ch. II.

³ Voir *Les œuvres libertines de Claude Le Petit*, précédées d'une notice biographique par F. Lachèvre, 1918.

⁴ Elle est reproduite dans la plupart des éditions annotées de Boileau, (*Art poétique*, II, sur la fin) y compris celle des Grands Ecrivains éditée par A. C. Gidel, t. II, 332, n. 2.

vers de l'*Art poétique* ⁵ rapporte précisément l'anecdote sur Claude Le Petit. C'est là que Voltaire a dû trouver son inspiration.⁶

E. VON DER MUHLL

Princeton University

VIGNY'S "ÉLÉVATIONS"

The obviously idealistic character of most of Alfred de Vigny's poetry is the result of a deep conviction, often expressed, of the poet. An undated passage in the *Journal d'un poète* says: "l'impuissant Zoile est porté dans l'azur par le poète créateur," and in the *Réflexions sur la vérité dans l'art* (1827) we read: "ce n'est qu'à la Religion, à la Philosophie, à la Poésie, qu'il appartient d'aller plus loin que la vie, au delà des temps jusqu' à l'éternité." The poet's feeling is perhaps best summarized by the word "élévation." This is applied to several prose passages in the *Journal*, from 1827 on. About 1829 Vigny planned a group of twelve poems to be called *Élévations*, few of which, however, were ever written. It is in a letter of 1838 that he formulated his theory most definitely: "J'ai nommé ces poèmes *Élévations* parce que tous doivent partir de la peinture d'une image toute terrestre pour s'élever à des vues d'une nature plus divine et laisser (autant que je le puis faire) l'âme qui me suivra dans les régions supérieures: la prendre sur terre et la déposer aux pieds de Dieu." In his collected poems the term "Élévation" is actually appended to the titles of only two pieces, and these by no means his best, *Les amants de Montmorency* and *Paris*. But it might very well be applied to many of his greatest poems, which exemplify finely the transition from a scene "toute terrestre" to "des vues d'une nature plus divine." Thus, in *Moïse*, we go from the description of the Holy Land and

⁵ Voici le passage en question:

Toutesfois n'allez pas, goguenard dangereux,
Faire Dieu le sujet d'un badinage affreux.
A la fin tous ces jeux que l'athéisme élève,
Conduisent tristement le plaisant à la Grève
(II, vers 187-190)

⁶ M. H. C. Lancaster a eu la bonté de me signaler le fait que V. Sardou, dans *l'Affaire des Poisons* (1908), s'est aussi servi d'un incident pareil.

the host of Hebrews to Moses' plaint to Jehovah; in *La mort du loup*, from a vivid hunting scene to doctrines of stoical philosophy; in *Le Mont des Oliviers*, from the scene in the garden to Christ's appeal to God for mercy to mankind; in *La maison du berger*, from the lowly shepherd's hut to lofty considerations on the might of nature and on the majesty of human suffering; in *les Destinées*, from the picture of man a hopeless slave of fate to a prayer for man's freedom; in *La bouteille à la mer*, from the wreck of a ship to the hymn of triumphant thought; in *L'esprit pur*, from an account of Vigny's ancestors to the reign of "pur esprit, roi du monde." These poems are, in truth, "Élévations," and remind us of Abbé Bremond's conclusion: "Les arts aspirent tous à rejoindre la prière."

GEO. N. HENNING

The George Washington University

REVIEWS

Atlante linguistico-etnografico italiano della Corsica promosso dalla R. Università di Cagliari, Introduzione. Par GINO BOTTIGLIONI, Pise: S. T. I. D., 1935. Pp. 230.

Les Raisons et les principaux caractères de l' "Atlante linguistico-etnografico italiano della Corsica" (A L E I C). Par GINO BOTTIGLIONI, Pise: 1936. Pp. 84, 3 cartes-spécimen et une planche de Guido Colucci.

Le critique qui lit l'introduction à l'Atlas corse destiné à remplacer l'Atl. lingu. de la Corse de Gilliéron et Edmont (dont seulement 2 volumes, et de valeur douteuse, ont apparu), doit éprouver une joie singulière en voyant réaliser des principes qu'il avait défendus depuis des années vis-à-vis d'orthodoxes adhérents de l'école de géographie linguistique et particulièrement leur maître, le génial et violent Gilliéron. Cette joie n'est pas tempérée, mais au contraire augmentée par le fait que l'auteur italien de l'Atlas corse ne semble pas avoir connu ces critiques, que je me permets d'énumérer pour mémoire: "Die Sprachgeographie," *Bull. de dialectologie romane* 1913; critique de l'Atlas linguistique de Catalogne, *ZRPh.* XLVI [1925], 614; critique de Sever Pop, "Buts et méthodes des enquêtes dialectales," *Literaturbl. f. germ. u. rom.*

Phil. 1928, col. 189; "Dictionnaires ou atlas linguistiques?"; *Revue internationale des études basques* 1929. L' 'Introduction' de M. Bottighioni à l'Atlas corse (A L E I C), dont cinq volumes ont paru (qui me sont restés inaccessibles) et qui complète l' A I S (Atlas ital.-suisse compilé par Jaberg-Jud), est une œuvre de méthodologie comparables à celles d'auteurs d'autres atlas, comme Jaberg-Jud, Scheuermeier, S. Pop, et on peut ainsi mesurer le chemin parcouru par la géographie linguistique depuis les premières tentatives de ce genre, les atlas de Weigand et de Gilliéron.

M. B. combat la prétendue nécessité de ne fixer sur les cartes que la réaction spontanée et de premier jet d'un seul sujet questionné par un seul explorateur, nécessité garantissant seule, nous disait-on, l'objectivité du relevé et la comparabilité des matériaux. L' A I S s'en tenait encore au postulat impérieux de Gilliéron. M. B. renonce au sujet unique et il reproche spirituellement à M. Scheuermeier d'avoir synthétisé les réponses divergentes d'un seul sujet en une forme-type—pourquoi alors ne pas synthétiser en une forme-type les formes données par plusieurs individus parlants de la même localité? M. B. renonce de même à l'explorateur unique parcourant à la hâte des régions différentes dont il ne connaît pas toujours le parler particulier, en faveur de connaisseurs (à noter le pluriel!) intimes du parler enquêté, qui synthétiseraient leurs observations: "*importa di sapere non come ha parlato il tale individuo in un certo momento, ma come si parla in un determinato paese.*" La conception de l'atlas-instantané est donc abandonnée. Des études préalables des conditions historiques, ethnographiques, géographiques et linguistiques des localités devront toujours précéder le relevé lui-même (les discordances de notre Atlas avec l'Atlas corse de Gilliéron au point de vue du choix des localités se sont révélées minimes, ce que notre auteur explique par le peu de densité de la population sur cette île, de sorte que n'importe quel explorateur aurait dû choisir les mêmes localités). Quant au questionnaire, notre auteur se distingue de ses prédécesseurs par l'introduction de phrases laissées en suspens que le sujet devait compléter—c'est d'ailleurs le système des grammaires françaises à l'usage d'enfants français—(p. ex. *è amaro come . . .* [il fiele, il tosc]); par l'adaptation préalable du questionnaire aux conditions ethniques et linguistiques de la région (ce principe, pas toujours réalisé, a pourtant été l'idéal d' à peu près tous les enquêteurs 'post-gilliéroniens'); par l'insistence sur ce point capital que "*il questionario deve rappresentare non il mezzo ma il fine dell' inchiesta,*" d'où dérive une certaine liberté des moyens employés pour provoquer des équivalences dialectales comparables entre elles: il ne s'agit pas p. ex. de fixer les réactions des sujets sur une même gravure, mais d'arriver, par les moyens les plus différents, à la vraie équivalence lexicographique; par l'inclusion de phrases seulement (innovation particulière: les proverbes si nom-

tion de réduire l'explorateur et son sujet à la machine ou à l'appareil enregistreur a faussé le rendement des atlas: sans l'intervention de Gilliéron, on aurait conclu que la connaissance préalable du dialecte qu'on étudie, la collaboration d'indigènes doués pour l'observation linguistique, la nécessité de retouches aux matériaux faits sur place si l'enquêteur a reconnu la fausseté de certains de ses relevés, la pluralité des observateurs et des observés se contrôlant mutuellement, une sorte de vie familière ensemble avec les sujets devraient influer utilement sur la qualité de la récolte: non, le pseudo-naturalisme, le *would-be-objectivisme* et l'idée de l'homme-machine dans le programme gilliéronien ont fait retarder l'horloge du progrès.² Gilliéron aimait écarter ces objections, en déplaçant habilement la question 'de droit' sur le domaine de la question de 'fait': Voyez pourtant l'œuvre qu'Edmont a su parfaire. . . . Mais l'Atlas corse d'Edmont, c'est-à-dire cet empiètement en somme grotesque d'un explorateur français habitué à manier des patois français, sur un dialecte italien qu'il ne connaissait pas suffisamment, a rendu justice de cette notion de l'homme-appareil pouvant *tout* enregistrer.

Je me réjouis de lire à la p. 177, au sujet d'un rédacteur de journal à Vénaco, M. Notini, qui a traduit par écrit dans son patois local le questionnaire, les lignes suivantes de M. B.: "Come si vede, siamo ben lungi dal metodo che comunemente si prescrive per la raccolta dagli atlanti linguistici: nessun interrogatorio diretto, nessuna esibizione di figure, nessun rigido meccanismo di preordinate domande, niente paura dell' autosuggestione."³ Saremmo al deprecato metodo di raccolta per corrispon-

² Combien la tradition gilliéronienne pèse encore sur ses élèves même les plus émancipés, on le voit par le fait que MM. Jaberg et Jud dans leur A I S ne se sont pas départis entièrement de la phobie de leur maître d'enregistrer les parlers des villes, soi-disant impurs; on sait que Paris, le centre d'irradiation linguistique le plus puissant de France, comme l'a précisément montré Gilliéron, ne figure pas sur l' A I F (qui montre donc les influences d'un facteur de premier ordre 'invisible et présent')—l' A I S, timide encore, n'enregistre que deux spécimens de parlers de villes aussi importantes que Florence, Venise, Milan—et Rome, qui est un amoncellement de petites villes et dont le quartier Trastevere mériterait un relevé *up to date*! On remarquera l'aveu de M. Jaberg, dans une étude basée sur l' A I S du mot *capo*, que l'auteur avoue incomplète ("Aspects géographiques du langage" p. 58) ". . . que sur la plupart des cartes en question les centres italiens ne sont pas représentés," et la résipiscence de la note 2 de la p. 82

³ Voir aussi ce que dit M. B. à la page 140 contre ce prétendu danger d'un enquêteur d'un parler qui serait un spécialiste de ce parler. "nella percezione e trascrizione dei suoni e delle forme che egli vien raccogliendo, deve necessariamente riferirsi a una lingua a lui familiare che lo suggestiona non meno di quella che avesse per avventura studiata prima, nella sua zona d'inchiesta." J'ajouterais encore une remarque: plus le spécialiste d'un parler *est préparé* à entendre une certaine variété de parler, plus il sera sensible aux nuances. Toute notation d'un mot suppose qu'on le *reconnaisse*—donc il faut en avoir une *connaissance* préalable: j'admire

denza, che io non condannerei affatto, se tutti i corrispondenti avessero l'intelligenza, il vivo interesse, la capacità generica e specifica del N." J'applaudis des deux mains, puisque j'ai, à diverses reprises, dit la même chose.

Qu'une observation critique me soit permise: l'auteur qui dans le chapitre "Il raccoglitore" se déclare convaincu de l'opinion de Bruneau: "L'enquêteur est réduit au rôle d'une machine," pour-quoi ne nous dit-il pas (d'ailleurs pas plus que ses prédécesseurs) ce par quoi il se distingue d'une machine, en d'autres termes, pour-quoi ne nous parle-t-il pas de sa propre personnalité? Je trouve cette réserve au point de vue de la propre biographie peu à sa place (Schuchardt ne la partageait pas): car comment pourrions-nous faire le départ entre les matériaux en soi et leur déformation nécessaire par l'"équation personnelle" de l'explorateur? Pour-quoi tous ces enquêteurs de parlers ne nous disent-ils pas en toute sincérité: je suis de tempérament cholérique, phlegmatique etc.; je suis plutôt du type auditif que visuel (ou le contraire), j'ai la réaction prompte ou lente; j'ai l'oreille plus affinée que l'entendement (ce qui peut arriver,—ou le contraire); mon intérêt est plutôt porté vers la phonétique ou vers la sémantique; je devine (ou non) un son très facilement par la mimique; je me fatigue vite ou lentement, j'ai (ou n'ai pas) le tempérament artistique etc.²⁴ Comme les atlas sont nécessairement moins des fixations du parler en soi que du dialogue entre un A enquêteur et un B enquêté, pour-quoi dissimuler l'un des partenaires? Si l'enquêteur n'est pas capable d'une auto-analyse sincère ou ne se sent pas en humeur introspective, pourquoi n'en charge-t-il pas un confrère, linguiste ou psychologue? Si un psychologue perspicace avait pu mettre un portrait exact de la personnalité d'Edmont (et peut-être aussi de Gillieron) à la tête de l'A L F, on ne se serait pas si étrangement mépris sur l'œuvre! On nous dira qu'il n'est pas usuel de mettre la biographie de l'auteur dans l'œuvre de science ou d'art—

toujours la dextérité de ces enquêteurs étrangers qui notent des mots qu'ils n'ont jamais entendus. Moi, personnellement, j'ai des difficultés à reconnaître sous la prononciation américaine le nom de tel auteur allemand qui m'est familier depuis des années et même des mots courants anglais que je connais bien—et un Edmont de St. Pol en Picardie a voulu noter le corse! On me dira: vous n'avez pas l'oreille d'Edmont. Entendu—mais est-ce qu'Edmont savait l'italien comme je sais l'anglais?

²⁴ M. B. nous dit, avec une gravité touchante: "ho fatto del mio meglio per avvicinarmi all' ideale del perfetto raccoglitore"—mais pourquoi ce nouveau Démosthène ne nous fait-il pas savoir l'écart entre ce qu'il était et ce qu'il est devenu à la suite de cet entraînement énergétique?

Combien je suis à l'aise en lisant sur l'avant-dernière page de notre volume des aveux inconscients comme ceux-ci: "La Corsica, l'isola bellissima, io l'ho percorsa a palmo a palmo, ma non l'ho goduta," "la dolce parlata di Dante e dei Trecentisti mi suonava all' orecchio, e questa musica era per me più dolce dell' armonia del paesaggio corso." Je suis renseigné maintenant sur la sensibilité particulière de M. Bottigioni—qui pourtant a ajouté un admirable album de vues et de types d'hommes corses à notre volume.

oui, mais parce que la personnalité de l'auteur s'exprime dans l'œuvre même, alors que les données soi-disant objectives des atlas nous font faire fausse-route. Je crois même que, plus on abandonnera le postulat de l'homme-machine, plus on regardera en face la subjectivité inhérente à toute enquête dialoguée, plus on aura de chance d'atteindre l'objectivité voulue. L'homme de science le sera véritablement, non pas s'il se diminue ou se rétrécit artificiellement, mais s'il n'abdique rien de ce qui est humain en lui. Le maximum d'humanité garantit le maximum de science.⁵

LEO SPITZER

The Johns Hopkins University

A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century, Part III, The Period of Molière, 1652-1672. In Two Volumes. By HENRY CARRINGTON LANCASTER. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1936. Pp. 896. Price \$10.00.

Le présent *reviewer* a décrit ici-même les deux premières parties de cette œuvre monumentale. Elle s'achevaient sur la conclusion que sans les productions des années 1635-1651, période où culmine Corneille, ni Molière ni Racine n'auraient été ce qu'ils furent.

C'est sous le signe de Molière que Lancaster place la présente et troisième partie de son étude. Et le buste de Racine est déjà fortement engagé dans la glaise que l'historien manie de ses puissantes et patientes mains. Les bas-reliefs, les frises et les chapiteaux, grouillants de vie mais clairement ordonnés, sont représentés par la description du fait social, technique, professionnel et par l'étude détaillée des productions. Ces productions sont nombreuses et le *reviewer* qui ne veut point être un résumeur n'ira pas se perdre dans les 301 pièces où L. se retrouve. Il dira simplement ce qui émerge dans son esprit une fois ces 900 pages lues.

C'est d'abord l'étroite et précoce liaison du fait politique, du fait Louis XIV, si on peut dire, avec le fait dramatique. C'est aussi l'*Hédonisme*, l'orientation vers le *plaisir* du public qui empreint les plus austères faiseurs de codes dramatiques. C'est le caractère complaisant, minutieux des recettes et des directives d'un d'Aubi-

⁵ Je me demande si la préoccupation de M. B. de ne poser que des questions en italien à ses sujets n'a pas dû un peu altérer—dans un sens contraire à la francisation edmontienne du corse—l'état actuel du dialecte, vu que, par l'école, le service militaire et l'administration, le français est assez répandu en corse. En somme, nous ne sommes pas, autant que je puisse voir, renseignés sur l'intensité du bilinguisme corse. Il aurait été intéressant de relever aussi le français de Corse (corse francisé ou français corsisé).

gnac dont la *Pratique du théâtre* est ici condensée (pp. 9-13). C'est dans le Corneille des *Discours* le même *Hédonisme* avec un plus grand esprit de liberté. C'est l'extraordinaire *interplay* de l'imitation et de l'invention qui, à propos d'un acte sans titre permet à L. de pénétrer dans le laboratoire dramatique de Scarron et de Molière, car, pour la fusion du métal étranger, la forge est la même. C'est à propos de Corneille le merveilleux esprit de renouvellement de ce vieux qui, loin de tourner en rond dans sa gloire et son passé, fut, dit L., un esprit "ahead of his times," un esprit plus inquiet que Racine le fut jamais de voir la tragédie se stéréotyper. Sans doute le Vieux songeait avant tout à soi, mais cela n'empêche qu'il y eût chez lui, dans ses *Discours*, dans ses expériences un besoin d'action, de propagande, si on peut dire, un altruisme intellectuel qui ne se retrouve pas chez Racine.

C'est enfin, c'est surtout la leçon de complétude, de vision concrète qui ressort de toutes les pages de L. On me permettra d'en marquer l'importance à propos de la question de l'Esprit classique: L. écrit (498) au sujet des *Machine-Plays*, de leur importance, de leur succès et de la façon dont Corneille et Molière mêmes les ont pratiquées, que ce phénomène doit être accepté, "however inconvenient it may appear to those critics who explain glibly the true meaning of *classicism*." Il y a dans cette observation de L. quelque chose qui tout ensemble rafraîchit et effraie. On peut en dire autant d'un autre coup de griffe que voici: "The Classical Age is thoroughly classical only to those who, through ignorance or prejudice, refuse to consider more than a portion of the facts." En fait la complétude cartésienne des revues et des dénombrements auxquels se livre L. s'oppose à ce qu'on admette les formules globales, les théories brillamment rigides sur le Classicisme. Prenons par exemple (et ici je voudrais pousser plus loin que lui la pensée de L.) cette idée assez convenue que le Stoïcisme était une sorte d'ambiance des âmes et des esprits de l'âge classique. Pour le croire on se base entre autres choses sur le succès de l'Idéalisme cornélien. Mais si on lit ce que L. nous dit sur Corneille, on voit encore et toujours chez celui-ci le souci de trouver, si on ose dire, les grands "trucs." Or pour lui le conflit entre devoir et nature, devoir et passion est un de ces "trucs" tout simplement. C'est un "ressort," un outil d'intérêt dramatique. Or qui dit "ressort" dit surprise. Si la subjugation de la passion par le devoir eût été cette norme vivante, cette habitude qu'on voudrait nous faire croire, s'il n'y avait pas eu là paradoxe, renversement de valeurs, il n'y eut pas eu un coup frappé, un ressort détendu. La même réflexion vient aussi à l'esprit à propos du roman cornélien qui s'appelle la *Princesse de Clèves*.

Même sujet de méditation en ce qui concerne le prétendu Idéalisme (non plus moral mais intellectuel et descriptif) de l'époque classique. Car le Réalisme de la Comédie, aux environs

de 1660, tel qu'il ressort des titres, des thèmes, des analyses, des citations fournis par L., est chose qui étonne. En effet il s'agit ici d'un Réalisme au second degré, minutieux, touche-à-tout, terre à terre, d'un détaillisme, si on peut dire, dont on ne peut se faire une idée juste si on ne sait rien des Gillet, Chappuzeau,¹ Villiers, Dorimond, Boucher, Chevalier, La Forge, Brécourt, Françoise Pascal, Champmeslé, Hauteroche, Montfleury fils, Visé et autres. Ces écrivains oubliés devraient être exploités avec les gazetiers, les mémorialistes et les épistoliers pour l'histoire de la société au XVII^e siècle. Voici jetés en vrac des exemples de ce qu'on trouve chez eux : Paris, ses quartiers, ses rues avec les cris et les métiers; les logeurs de garnis, les taverniers et les buveurs; les cuisiniers et les gastronomes; une *Rôtisserie*; des *Ramoneurs*; les *Carosses à cinq sous*; les portiers et les affichistes de théâtre; les *Intrigues de la loterie*; les tireurs et tricheurs de cartes; les grisettes; les bouquetières; les abbés galants et les chevaliers d'industrie; les maquignons; des paysans, des provinciaux; des étrangers (voire des Russes) de tout poil et de tout dialecte. Ce réalisme au second degré paraît une sorte d'avancée vers le théâtre de la Foire et vers le XVIII^e siècle. Mais un fait remarquable c'est que ces auteurs si familiers, si libres s'en tiennent à une technique classique "in the main" (46), ne violant guère en fait de règles que celles des bienséances.

Quant aux hardiesses d'idées elles sont rares : On n'en trouve guère que chez Cyrano et Hauteroche. Mais le *Colbert enragé* récemment édité par G. van Roosbroeck est d'une franche audace politique.² La langue de ces pièces est, à en juger par les nombreuses citations de Lancaster, fort intéressante. Elle a un ton parlé, vif et chaud, qui rappelle celui de certaines farces du XV^e siècle. D'autre part, le tour et l'humour d'un Scarron sentent les ruses et les gaïetés verbales de Hugo et de Rostand. Beaucoup de ces auteurs étaient des acteurs comme Molière (qui, directeur de troupe, n'était pas payé comme tel mais recevait double part comme acteur et comme auteur).

Le Molière de L. est remarquable par la fermeté du crayon biographique. Fermeté qui va jusqu'à la sècheresse voulue, bien qu'on sente dans sa concision même une fougue de justice et d'admiration pour son modèle. Peut-être par réaction contre les faux coloristes L. refuse-t-il certaines nuances et certaines ombres qui pourtant seraient justes. Ainsi une ombre d'amertume; ainsi une nuance de subjectivisme. Mais on approuvera pleinement ce qu'il dit sur l'activité et les buts de Molière. Il souligne avec vigueur

¹ Une Physionomie qui est par ailleurs comme cosmopolite d'un intérêt très marqué. Il fut le premier Français à mettre en Chine l'action d'une pièce, *Armetzar*, 1650.

² Le même Van R. a soulevé au sujet du *Trasibule* de Montfleury et du *Hamlet* de Shakespeare un important débat qui ne me semble pas fermé malgré les conclusions de L. (pp 551-4).

que Molière ne fut pas un réformateur, mais un homme de théâtre encore et toujours. Il fut occupé avant tout de *plaire*, comme le fut Corneille à l'autre bout du champ des émotions. Il cherchait des sujets; il voyait la société, l'humanité comme un trésor de sujets et non comme un objet de morale. Cette immense Sagesse toute simple qui fait sa morale il ne l'inspire que parce qu'il la respire—presque sans le savoir.

Pour l'œuvre de Molière en ses sources et sa technique l'étude que nous en donne L. est nettement *centrée*, se distingue par la précision avec laquelle l'œuvre est *située*. Ici l'historien était admirablement servi par la minutieuse enquête qu'il avait fait porter sur tout le domaine dramatique depuis 1610. Voici très en gros ce qu'il voit: Il est aisé de trouver ce qui a influencé Molière; il est impossible de trouver ce qui l'a, si on peut dire, originé. Lanson pour ce dernier point répondait: la Farce. Mais L., bien qu'il constate le regain vigoureux de la Farce à l'époque de Molière, en ramène l'influence à des proportions modestes. Il pense que le précoce éclectisme des goûts et des emprunts de Molière s'oppose à toute idée unitaire de la genèse de son œuvre. Molière est un génie de fusion composite. Ses sources sont extrêmement éparpillées dans tout le domaine latin depuis Plaute jusqu'à Chappuzeau. Il prend de toute main, surtout des mots de théâtre, des *gags* et des situations. Il transforme le plus souvent ce qu'il emprunte mais pressé il lui arrive de transplanter tout vif. Il a aussi emprunté de larges faits de technique, par exemple à Corneille une "révolution" dramatique dont L. souligne l'importance pour la présentation des événements (247-248). Plus on sait, comme L., de choses sur Molière et plus on le voit emprunteur et pourtant riche de soi-même. Si on pouvait résoudre cette antinomie, on aurait la clef du problème du Génie, c'est-à-dire de l'Individualité. En ce qui concerne Molière nous sentons confusément que son propre, ce par quoi il est lui-même et ce qui de lui demeure c'est cette gaïeté folle en marche vers la Sagesse (*Le Bourgeois . . .*; le *Malade . . .*), et d'autre part cette profondeur un peu triste (oui, même si point romantique) qu'il apporte à décrire des personnages qui manquent à la Sagesse ou à la Nature (*l'Avare*, *Tartuffe*, le *Misanthrope*). Les personnages en question pouvaient être déjà dans les livres ou sur les planches, mais leur essence moliéresque ne vient pas de là. Pour ses constructions—là on pourrait retirer les briques d'emprunt sans que le bâtiment, sans que les bonshommes s'écroulent. L'extrême difficulté de saisir au juste chez Molière l'*interplay* des influences avec l'observation individuelle est très sensible à propos de *Tartuffe*. Chaque situation, presque chaque élément de cette œuvre se retrouve quelque part avant Molière et le personnage lui-même à plusieurs ancêtres et cousins (624 et seq.). Et cependant *Tartuffe* s'est rencontré probablement dans la ligne de vision de Molière comme un personnage de chair et d'os, non de papier, quelqu'un enfin que Molière a non pas lu mais connu, coudoyé.

La triste essence de ce faux-bonhomme n'est pas contenue dans l'alambic où on peut distiller les influences de Sorel, d'Audiguier, Scarron, Salas Barbadillo, etc.

Pour Alceste l'analyse que L. en donne (657-659) est, franchement, la meilleure que je connaisse. Il s'agit surtout ici d'apprécier le degré de comique du personnage, car c'est au fond à ce problème que se ramène toute analyse du caractère d'Alceste. L. souligne aussi l'allure non point largement sociale mais *mondaine* de l'observation de Molière dans cette pièce. A propos d'Alceste encore L. fait observer quelque part (je cite de mémoire) qu'il doit préférer au sujet de ce caractère certaines conclusions qui ne procèdent pourtant point de la méthode que lui, L., préfère. Je m'emparerai de cet aveu plein de probité libre pour apprécier cette méthode. C'est une grande et belle méthode mais essentiellement descriptive. Les relevés et les analyses, les dénombrements cartésiens de tous les faits contrôlables y servent à des synthèses où les faits et les chiffres se retrouvent encore et qui tracent des courbes, figurent un mouvement (mouvement descendant de la tragi-comédie, brièvement ascendant de la pastorale; montée des *Machine-Plays* et des comédies-ballets; élan repris par la tragédie avec le vieux Corneille; ascendant marqué de la comédie). Il est remarquable de voir comment la portion critique, appréciation esthétique, de l'œuvre de L. demeure encore et toujours historique. Grâce à son incomparable et constante confrontation des pièces avec les codes L. réduit au minimum la part de son équation personnelle, subjective. Il décrit: il ne décrète point. Historien encore et toujours il a horreur de l'anachronisme. C'est pourquoi il se garde (un peu trop à mon avis) des rapprochements avec le futur et l'actuel et se garde aussi de voir les faits du passé sous l'angle de tendances métaphysiques, sociologiques, psychologiques modernes. Si, dans ce refus, il y a consentement à certaines limites, ces limites sont conscientes, voulues. Mais qu'importe après tout (sauf pour des spéculatifs chimériques de mon espèce) ces problèmes de tendances, de courants critiques? Ce qui importe c'est le résultat. Or le résultat c'est l'œuvre la plus belle d'utilité tangible qu'on nous ait jamais donnée sur le sujet.

LOUIS CONS

Columbia University

Albums poétiques de Marguerite d'Autriche. Par MARCEL FRANCON. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. Paris: Droz, 1934. Pp. 300.

La Période, la Personnalité-centre, le Groupe ici présentés offrent un intérêt certain. La Période est, pour l'incubation des œuvres, l'extrême fin du moyen-âge et, pour la mise au jour, la seconde décade du XVI^e siècle. Période-charnière et frontière.

La Personnalité est celle de l'inspiratrice des Albums. C'est cette Marguerite d'Autriche dont la figure a été récemment éclairée par Max Bruchet, A. Chagny et F. Girard, J. Jacquemain, Ghislène de Bloom et M. F. lui-même. Sur les goûts, la lecture et la culture de Marguerite il nous donne (pp. 23-28) une esquisse courte mais précise et pleine, comme tout son portrait de la princesse en question. Le Groupe c'est les rimeurs courtisans auxquels sont dus les 111 rondeaux, les 25 chansons et les 3 ballades (seulement) des *Albums*, avec un dictier en dialogue et 22 textes latins. Sauf Marguerite pour une pièce (xxv, autographe), et Jean Le Maire pour deux (cxxxix et cxxx) les auteurs ne sont pas identifiés. Mais ils sont fort identiques. Excepté qu'on voit se dessiner çà et là de petits blocs un peu distincts, il y a une remarquable homogénéité dans l'Impersonnel. Et, il faut bien le dire, dans le Médiocre. Le thème, c'est Amour en ses formes désireuses et languoureuses avec, parfois, l'expression des ennuis de l'existence, *mérencolie* et tout son train. On "pense" en série, à coup de proverbes et la sensibilité consiste en extases froides. Pourtant telles pièces où l'auteur est sincère parce que narquois (un des traits du temps) ont du relief. Ainsi LIII, LVI, LXX, LXXXVIII.

Au reste il faut se dire que l'intime association de la musique et de la poésie—traitée comme support de la première—explique le nonchaloir ou l'absence de l'expression verbale personnelle.¹ On pourrait paraphraser le mot de Figaro et écrire: Ce qui se chante ne vaut pas la peine d'être dit. A ce propos, rappelons que le texte musical des *Albums* est dû à Agricola, Brumel, de la Rue, Compère, Josquin Desprès, en somme l'école du grand Ockeghem. Bien que M. F. n'édite ni n'étudie ce texte musical il a (pp. 44-47) au sujet du *motet* et de la teneur des chants de judicieuses et originales observations. Ne peut-on dire que la Musique a fait la Lyrique (au sens antique et propre) du moyen-âge mais l'a défaite au sens moderne de poésie subjective?

Et puis, pour être juste, il faut dans ces productions impersonnelles des *Albums* reconnaître parfois une certaine aspiration à l'élégance formelle qui frôle la Renaissance. Même en ce qui regarde le penser et le sentir, la subtilité emblématique de tels de ces rondeaux (XLII, LXXX, par exemple) fait un petit peu songer à l'école lyonnaise. Au fait savons-nous bien si Scève qui doit tant aux Italiens ne doit absolument rien aux Bourguignons?

Enfin, comme M. F. l'a si bien vu, l'intérêt de ce groupe n'est pas sa valeur mais son fait même: un cercle autour d'une patronne qui était traditionaliste et cosmopolite tout ensemble. Il y avait là un climat qui valait mieux que les fruits.

Curieuse époque décidément que cet automne du moyen âge: à certains égards un ritualisme figé et, à d'autres, transition, fluidité!

¹ C'est là une des justes observations de M. W. F. Patterson dans le livre de lui dont nous avons rendu compte ici-même.

... Ainsi en est-il de la langue à laquelle M. F. consacre une brève étude qui met en valeur "l'instabilité, l'absence de norme" (pp. 59-67). Récemment la publication par E. Droz de *Soties* du recueil Trepperel est venue (mais cette fois pour la langue parlée, gesticulée, populaire enfin, du XV^e siècle) apporter un nouvel aliment à nos curiosités à ce point de vue. On apprendrait beaucoup de choses si on pouvait tenir sous le même regard des manifestations, socialement aussi contrastantes, que lesdites *Soties* et les *Albums*. Il y faudrait joindre ces quelque 600 rondeaux que M. F. a indexés avec d'intéressantes remarques dans un article sur *Rondeaux d'amour du XV^e siècle*, paru en 1935 dans le Volume 16 des *Harvard Studies . . . in Literature*. M. F. identifie un tiers environ de ces rondeaux comme se retrouvant en des recueils ultérieurs. Ainsi l'un d'eux, du plein XV^e, reparait en 1582 dans le *Courtizan Amoureux*. Indice—non du tout unique—de la survivance du courtois médiéval.

Nous avouons aimer la hardiesse sensée avec laquelle M. F. bouscule des distinctions convenues entre poésie aristocratique et poésie bourgeoise. Et la façon dont, sans se faire illusion sur l'originalité des Rhétoriciens, il sait mesurer le pas que ces pauvres Velléitaires de l'Art ont fait vers les Volontaires de la Pléiade. Dans le champ du *Quattrocento* bourguignon et armagnac M. F. fera son chemin et sa marque. Il offre un dosage heureux de l'esprit de géométrie et de l'esprit de finesse.²

LOUIS CONS

Columbia University

² Dans l'édition des *Albums* donnée par M. F. le sens peut se rétablir parfois au delà de l'extrême prudence sceptique de l'éditeur. Au rondeau VI, vers 6, la graphie *A luvré* éclaire la phrase que le rétablissement d'un (*A luvrer*) rend incompréhensible. Au rondeau XXXI le vers 5 semble devoir être compris comme opposant *promptement* à *credo*, un *credo* étant ici un prêt à échéance.

Au rondeau XLII, le 3^e vers contient un calembour déplorable entre "seconde personne" c'est-à-dire *tu* et *tue* (Il est question de quelqu'un qui se tue).

Le rondeau XLIV "pur galimatias," dit M. F., n'est pas inintelligible. Il a, comme d'autres de ces pièces, la marque d'un auteur féminin qui a lu Christine de Pisan.

Le rondeau LIV s'éclaire si on comprend *souvre*, au vers 9, comme venant de *supra* avec le sens de *reste*, *d'extra* et *ouvre*, au vers 10, comme une forme non *d'ouvrir* mais *d'ouvrer*. Au rondeau LV, vers 11, *suppetit* de *suppetere* peut se comprendre comme "est encore présente, est encore sous la main pour mon usage" (Il s'agit d'une maîtresse douteuse qui s'en va mais n'est point encore partie).

Au rondeau LIX si on rétablit, aux vers 8 et 11, *assouvi* et *deservi* pour *assouvir* et *deservir*, le sens revient, bien que la rime avec *servir* du dernier vers tombe—pour l'oeil. Mais il doit y avoir là un problème de prononciation.

Au rondeau LXIII, vers 6, *parcial soy tenir* retrouve un sens si on le rapproche du vers 8 qui dit: "De ma part riens je ne propose."

On notera comme cause d'obscurité gratuite dans ces pièces la confusion de *que* et de *qui*.

Romans français du moyen âge, Essais. Par ANDRÉE BRUEL. Paris: Droz, 1934. Pp. 446. Fr. 24.

Sous un titre qui n'annonce pas une étude complète (*Romans* . . . et non *Les Romans* . . .) et un sous-titre modeste mais spacieux, *Essais*, on nous donne ici la seule biographie du roman médiéval que nous ayons.¹ On regrettera l'absence de *Tristan* et du *Graal*, tâche lourde et délicate que Mlle Bruel eût été digne d'entreprendre. Mais en ce qu'elle nous donne elle nous a bien servis. Car son livre qui ne se veut point érudit est bien informé. *Et il est bien écrit.*

Le lecteur, une fois ce livre solide et plaisant refermé, garde en l'esprit une chaîne dont les deux bouts sont Chrétien de Troyes et *Jehan de Paris* et les anneaux principaux Jean Renart, *Flamenca*, les *romans tragiques*, puis les humoresques et les nouvelles du XV^e siècle. Quand nous disons "une chaîne" c'est de notre part une image qui, si on peut dire, prend parti. Ce parti, cette idée c'est la continuité du roman médiéval au sein des œuvres diverses que Mlle B. nous présente. Œuvres peu nombreuses, auxquelles manquent ces types importants que nous avons dits plus haut, mais qui sont tout de même représentatives. Or nous voyons—d'après ce qu'on nous donne—que la fameuse distinction entre deux plans plus ou moins hermétiquement séparés, Courtois et Bourgeois, ne joue plus très bien. Il n'y a en effet aucune de ces œuvres où on puisse trouver ni le Courtois ni le Bourgeois à l'état pur. Chrétien de Troyes? Mais si sa matière est courtoise, son sens intime est haut-bourgeois. Jean Renart? Mais sa vision du chevaleresque même est d'un réalisme collé au sol. Les romans tragiques? Mais leurs dénouements son du tragique populaire,² bien plus que du Courtois.

¹ A part les chapitres dispersés des histoires de la littérature Les travaux sur les origines, les sources, d'un Faral ou d'un Loomis, d'un Ch. v. Langlois sur l'étoffe sociale des romans du moyen âge, ne sont pas par définition des synthèses du genre que nous voulons dire. Et moins encore les nombreux travaux sur des aspects ou des romans particuliers. Seule l'étude de W. Söderhjelm—plus appuyée mais plus restreinte par son champ—de *La Nouvelle au XV^e siècle* rentrait dans notre idée de biographie d'un genre.

² Ces dénouements apparentent les romans tragiques à l'Ovide des *Métamorphoses*. Et l'on pourrait parler ici pour ces romans d'une dérivation ovidienne, humaniste. Mais il faut se dire qu'Ovide avait puisé ces sombres histoires dans le folk lore, dans le peuple. A côté de l'Ovide "savant" qui par ses analyses a fourni des linéaments au Courtois il y a un Ovide "populaire" ou du moins coïncidant avec le populaire.

Ce que nous disons là au sujet des dénouements des *romans tragiques* s'applique au dénouement de *Tristan*, à l'histoire des deux voiles: Souvenir "humaniste" si l'on veut, mais coïncidant avec le "populaire."

Dans ces romans tragiques nous sommes tentés de voir des "dramas de la haute" contés par des gens du commun. On y jouit du contraste, si aimé du peuple de tout temps, entre les apparences de la noblesse et le déchaînement des passions communes.

Quant au Bourgeois il a l'air de triompher à plein dans, par exemple, *Les xv Joyes*, une humoresque parfaitement libérée de tout élément courtois. Mais qu'on songe un peu à ce dur détachement, à ce mépris pour les choses et les gens de la vie commune! Combien peu bourgeois en est l'esprit, le sens intime! Mais bien clérical-aristocrate (comme à notre avis le *Patheln*). *Les Cent Nouvelles*? Bourgeoises en la matière, en l'esprit si on veut (mais encore ceci n'irait pas sans difficultés), mais ressassées par de grands seigneurs qui sûrement se sentaient de plain pied avec cet esprit-là? Et qui jamais tracera dans *Jehan de Saintré*, dans *La Sale*, et dans celui-là qui fit *Jehan de Paris*, la frontière entre Courtois et Bourgeois?

Le *Graal*, que malheureusement on ne nous donne point, fut, lui, sorti de cette ligne, pour se perdre dans le plan mystique. Mais le plan qui se dessine là c'est celui de l'Ascèse opposée au siècle, au monde aussi bien chevaleresque, courtois que bourgeois. Sous le regard de feu du monasticisme bernardien devaient fondre comme neige ces distinctions de castes, dont on nous semble surfaire et la séparation hermétique et l'influence littéraire.

Ce ne sont là que quelques-uns des problèmes que soulève la vue perspective tracée d'une main très personnelle par Mlle B., avec tant d'intelligence serviable et d'élégante fermeté.³

LOUIS CONS

Columbia University

Etat présent des études sur Villon. Par LOUIS CONS. Paris: Belles-Lettres, 1936. Pp. 161. 10 fr.

The title of this book might lead one to expect little more than a *bibliographie raisonnée*. Instead, M. Cons has given us a study of Villon through the ages that not only projects the poet against the background of his own day, but so synthesizes the views of succeeding epochs and various countries about him that at times these luminous pages constitute a miniature history of literary ideas.¹

³ Mlle. B. donne le texte original de ses citations avec une modernisation fidèle. Il y a quelques menues exceptions à cette fidélité. P. 64, la traduction de "rantiers" par "hommes" affaiblit (peut-être inévitablement) le dur sens de l'expression de Félice. En revanche, p. 69, la trad. "passion" pour "dedit" force le sens. Ce n'est pas à proprement parler de sentiment mais de conduite qu'il est question ici. Il y a aussi une légère inexactitude de ton et de force dans la traduction que M. Wilmotte, suivi par Mlle B., donne de "retraire" par "imiter" alors que "ressembler" est ici le vrai (p. 19). Page 23, le difficile vers 2442 de *Erec* (dont Foerster a esquissé l'interprétation) est traduit comme si *el*, qui est neutre, était féminin. P. 59, l'ordre des notes 2 et 3 est interverti.

¹ Cf. the chapter-headings: Villon Ancien Régime, Villon et les Romantiques, Villon redécouvert, Allemagne, Angleterre, Espagne, Italie, etc.

Moreover, into his delicate, subtle and penetrating analyses of the works of others, the author has woven interpretations of his own that are original and constructive. Thus, to take one example among many, in estimating Siciliano's recent work, he justly regards it as "un maître livre" (p. 133), but keenly observes: "dans son livre, où il y a tant d'esprit, c'est l'Esprit du moyen âge qui manque le plus . . ." (p. 122), and proceeds himself to supply that want by sketching a deft and vivid picture of the later middle ages.

The volume also makes clear Cons' personal conception of the poet, a Villon whose intense egotism was tempered by intelligence and a certain disinterested objectivity, a Villon *réel* and a Villon *vrai*, a man who was *un raillard pas mal cynique* but who could become on occasion *grand, quasi pur* (pp. 70-1, 136). It is difficult in a volume so packed with good things to point out the most fruitful suggestions. Especially stimulating should be the new material in the chapter on the Romantics, who would seem to have appreciated Villon far less than is usually believed (pp. 38-60), and the pages in which the *Testament* is plausibly regarded as lacking unity of composition but as revealing a certain unity of passion inspired by the poet's desperate hatred of Thibaud d'Aussigny (pp. 138 ff.). Some may question the amount of space devoted to a Bernard or a Desonay, but all will be grateful for Cons' appraisal of the work of such men as Schwob, Champion, Thuasne, Neri and Siciliano, in which, as throughout the book, an incisive clarity of judgment mingles with an urbane reasonableness. In short, this is a volume "d'un savant autant que d'un lettré," which, like that earlier volume of Gaston Paris, should appeal to all who would understand Villon.²

Bryn Mawr College

GRACE FRANK

Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence: La Vie de Saint Thomas Becket.

Éditée par EMMANUEL WALBERG. Paris: Classiques français du moyen âge 77 (1936). Pp. xxiv + 265. Fr. 24.

The account of Becket's life and death by Guernes of Pont-Sainte-Maxence is the most significant of all the literary versions.¹ Its tenor is hagiographical rather than historiographical. Guernes gives us various data as to its composition in a kind of prologue and epilogue, ll. 141-165 and 6156-6180. He completed it at

¹ Three small slips will doubtless be corrected in a second edition: p. 23, last line, read 1456 for 1461; p. 84 supply a reference to the foot-note; p. 104 read Burns for Burne. Some reference to the unreliability of the variants supplied by Thuasne's edition would have been welcome.

² P. A. Brown, *The Development of the Legend of Thomas Becket*, Philadelphia, 1930, p. 10.

Canterbury in 1174. It is divided into 1236 monorimed strophes of five alexandrine verses. The poem survives in five main manuscripts: B, H, P, C, W. Back in 1838 Bekker edited B quite sedulously, and in 1844 he reproduced H to fill in the lacunae. Hippeau's edition of 1859 was a faulty reproduction of the faulty manuscript P. In 1922 Walberg published a very satisfactory text, using B as the basal manuscript and H for the lacunae. As for the textual emendations proposed by Breuer and Schultz-Gora, Walberg has justified his rejection of them.² Breuer has also published³ certain variants of C although C, as well as W, is practically useless in establishing the text. On p. xiv of the 1936 edition Walberg describes his first edition ambiguously as an "édition critique établie à l'aide de tous les manuscrits connus"; yet the difference between his two texts is well nigh negligible.⁴ In the introduction to the present edition, Walberg summarizes his extensive and valuable investigations into the history, literature, and philology⁵ of the Becket theme. To the selective glossary may be added the following terms, which combine (1) forms having a peculiar orthography, (2) words used in a rare sense, (3) corrections of misprints, and (4) differences of interpretation:

s'aitier 3191 *prendre bon courage*; aparmaines 3016; metre en araisunement 2434 *prévenir, consulter*, asensement 3146 *avis, avertissement*; en bescoz 5608: G Paris, *Romania*, xviii (1899), 145; busung 5920 *besom*; chute 3938 *coude*; en defit 4968: Tobler-Lommatszsch II, 1288; demaineté 2467 *domaine direct*; devié 2433, 4972 *interdit, excommunication*: Godefroy II, 699a, *estreindre le conseil* 462, *fauser de covenant* 1018 *se dérober à ce qu'on a promis*: the erroneous reference to *Gus de Cambrai* in the 1922 ed., p. 238, is corrected in *Romania*, lviii (1932), 439 (cf. *Yvain* 2660); for 1455 *fors, sauf, excepté*. Godefroy IV, 95 (cf. H Pflaum, *Romania*, lxx (1933), 403); *fors* (après une proposition négative) 2280, 5417 *mais*. *Chroniques de Froissart* xix, 222; *avoir gros quer* 4974, *heser* 6047 *mettre les heuses, chausser*, *sei tierce main* 1406 *par l'affirmation en justice de trois personnes*: 1922 ed, p. 243 (La Curne de Sainte-Palaye VII, 223b, F. Liebermann, *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, II, 139); *metler* 6150 *machiner*, *plain* 163 *plénitude*; 299 *loyal*; 1407 *évident*, 1467 *clair*; 4375 *entier*; *el present* 2341 *en présence de, devant*; *faire le purquei* 2359 *instruire*; *quaranteine* 6051 *pénitence durant quarante jours*: 1922 ed., p. 312; *salse* 6150 *affaire désagréable*: 1922 ed., p. 316 (Godefroy, *Compl.*, x, 618); *estre a us* 3853 *avoir l'habitude*: 1922 ed., p. 276.

RAPHAEL LEVY

University of Baltimore

² *Lit. ger. rom. Phil.*, xlv (1924), 187-9; *Z R Ph.*, LI (1931), 548-568.

³ *Z R Ph.*, XLIII (1923), 356-363.

⁴ Even the distinction between *é* and *è* is preserved.

⁵ I suggest that on page xxiii *augur* 3099, *auchur* 4459 < *altuorem* be omitted, *haugur* 2929 reflects the influence of *haut*.

Au Temps de l'Encyclopédie, L'Académie de Dijon de 1740 à 1793.

Par ROGER TISSERAND. Paris: Boivin (1936). Pp. 683.

Les Concurrents de J.-J. Rousseau à l'Académie de Dijon pour le Prix de 1754. Par ROGER TISSERAND. Paris: Boivin (1936).

Pp. 219.

Nous avons déjà une monographie de l'Académie de Marseille (par Dassy, 1877), une autre de l'Académie de Bordeaux (par J. de Gères, 1879), une autre de Besançon (par Pingault, 1892); plus récemment un volume sur *Les Académies provinciales, salons ou sociétés savantes* (par A. Féron, Rouen 1934), et les livres de D. Mornet constamment cités par M. Tisserand,—pour nous faire saisir l'ambiance du siècle des "philosophes." Il y avait aussi, en ce qui concerne Dijon en particulier, *La Vie littéraire à Dijon au XVIII^e siècle*, de l'abbé Deberre (1902), et surtout le gros livre récent de M. Bouchard, *De l'Humanisme à l'Encyclopédie. l'Esprit public en Bourgogne sous l'ancien régime* (Paris, 1930). La présente formidable monographie de M. Tisserand est une histoire extrêmement minutieuse, disons même un peu prolixe, de cette Académie qui s'illustra auprès de la postérité surtout pour avoir lancé Rousseau dans sa glorieuse carrière. On y travailla du reste beaucoup dans cette Académie qui reçut ses lettres patentes le 30 juin 1740 et qui sombra comme toutes ses sœurs dans l'ouragan de la Révolution, elle se releva à la Restauration, mais l'histoire de M. Tisserand s'arrête en 1793. A très peu d'exceptions près—sauf deux *Discours* de Rousseau et un mémoire du marquis d'Argenson—on ne peut signaler que d'honnêtes, et parfois solides travaux; M. Tisserand en a compté exactement 1867 et il nous renseigne sur un grand nombre d'entre eux. Qu'on s'intéresse spécialement à Rousseau ou non, il est bien certain que seules les quelques pages se rapportant à ses deux *Discours* présentent un intérêt exceptionnel (p. 550 à 556, *plus*, ici et là, quelques allusions en passant). Les lettres et les arts intéressèrent du reste toujours modérément l'Académie de Dijon; les sciences accaparaient presque exclusivement l'attention, à Dijon comme dans les autres Académies provinciales selon M. Mornet.

A notre savoir c'est la première fois que nous avons quelque chose de clair sur Rousseau à l'Académie de Dijon. Il en ressort ceci, que le sujet du *Discours* de 1749 fut reçu en quelque sorte en contrebande par les membres de l'Académie: "Un esprit faux de l'Académie [Claude Gelot], écrit Ruffey dans son *Histoire secrète*, proposa ce problème. *Si les arts et les sciences ont contribué à épurer les mœurs.* Il fut adopté sans réflexion et donné au public pour sujet du prix de 1750" (cité p. 186); les Académiciens ne furent pas moins . . . étourdis, ensuite, en couronnant un mémoire si révolutionnaire préférablement à celui de l'orthodoxe abbé Tal-

bert; l'ennui résultant des critiques et des sarcasmes fut grand, et la mauvaise conscience des Académiciens, persistante,—si bien qu'en 1756 encore le coupable (Gelot) sentait encore qu'il devait faire amende honorable en lisant en séance du 17 décembre un mémoire intitulé "La société vengée des attentats d'un misanthrope, ou réfutation du Discours de M. Rousseau de Genève sur l'Inégalité des conditions."¹

La question du *Second Discours* fait l'objet de la petite thèse de M. Tisserand. Elle explique plus en détail les raisons qui firent refuser à Rousseau le prix de 1754. Clairement ce n'est pas la longueur qui fut le motif déterminant, (quand même il est bien vrai que le mémoire est beaucoup plus long que tous les autres présentés), mais c'est que l'Académie avait été si vivement critiquée pour avoir couronné le *Discours* de 1750. M. Tisserand le prouve abondamment à notre sens: L'Académie avait à se faire pardonner. On dira: mais les auteurs n'étaient pas connus. Non, mais le contenu suffisait à montrer un esprit aussi dangereux que celui du concours de 1750; et, d'ailleurs, on a des raisons de croire que l'Académie avait eu vent du fait que le mémoire N^o. 6 était de la main de Rousseau. M. T. suggère qu'il avait été lu d'avance par certains membres et écarté d'emblée. Le mémoire couronné—tout à fait orthodoxe—fut celui du chanoine Talbert (qui avait été en concurrence avec Rousseau déjà en 1750): une véritable homélie expliquant tant bien que mal que le monde est ce qu'il est, bien mauvais certes; or, s'il était pire, ce serait simplement le chaos; il y a donc lieu d'être encore bien reconnaissant à Dieu de n'avoir pas infligé à l'homme le pire. La manuscrit de Rousseau est aujourd'hui perdu; il l'avait réclamé pour l'impression; ainsi on ne sait pas jusqu'à quel point le texte original a été modifié. M. T. donne quelques indications aussi au sujet du mémoire du marquis d'Argenson (N^o. 5); celui-ci était si désireux d'être couronné qu'il fit savoir sans trop de discrétion qu'il était l'auteur—mais la probité de l'Académie refusa la suggestion.

Le gros du volume consiste en une édition des onze mémoires sur treize du concours (un autre manuscrit manque outre celui de Rousseau)—édition qui ne nous paraît pas d'un intérêt prodigieux. Sera-t-il permis de demander pourquoi M. T. n'a pas plutôt édité avec soin le *Discours* de Rousseau—car cette édition manque. Ce qu'il a préféré faire lui a donné l'occasion de montrer une sérieuse érudition en indiquant les rapprochements à faire entre ces mémoires et la pensée contemporaine. On peut s'étonner, cependant,

¹ Disons en passant que tout cela n'empêchait pas l'Académie de saisir les occasions qui se présentèrent plus tard en couronnant Rousseau pour rappeler sa perspicacité. Par exemple, en 1791, lorsque l'Académie déplora publiquement la mort de Mirabeau, l'orateur s'écriait "A qui convient-il de remplir ce devoir plus qu'à l'Académie à laquelle la France et toutes les nations doivent l'auteur du *Contrat social*?"

de ce titre de "sources" qu'il donne à un chapitre. Si les auteurs avaient eux-mêmes plus souvent dit que tel ou tel auteur était "source" soit! mais c'est le cas si rarement qu'on ne peut pas plus indiquer comme *sources* Locke, Barbeyrac, Montesquieu, Bossuet ou La Bruyère qu'on peut indiquer comme n'étant *pas sources* les ouvrages de Voltaire (p. 40). Il s'agit presque toujours d'idées qui sont "dans l'air" comme on dit: Qui aujourd'hui oserait affirmer chez un contemporain parlant des droits de l'ouvrier, de dictature politique, de "conscientious objectors," que la *source* soit directement Marx, Nietzsche ou Tolstoi?

ALBERT SCHINZ

University of Pennsylvania

L'Œuvre et l'âme de Jules Renard. Par LÉON GUICHARD. Paris: Nizet et Bastard, 1936, Pp. 599.

L'Interprétation graphique cinématographique et musicale des œuvres de Jules Renard. Par LÉON GUICHARD. Paris: Nizet et Bastard, 1936, Pp. 228.

These two large excellently-printed companion-theses constitute both a noteworthy example of scholarship in the field of literary history and criticism and an imposing tribute to the genius of Jules Renard. The main portion of the principal thesis is divided into four thorough-going, well-balanced chapters on Renard's literary aims and achievements. Here Guichard studies, with the aid of copious citations from Renard's writings and especially from his journal and his correspondence, the artist's development from mere imitativeness in poetry and prose to complete mastery of his medium. Renard's juvenile "plaquette" of verses, *les Roses*, has little in common with his mature work, for there are lacking "dans ce léger bagage poétique" two of the most characteristic qualities of the man and the writer: "*la sincérité et la simplicité.*"¹ In his first prose works, too, Renard made a "faux départ," reflecting at every turn his reading of George Sand, Flaubert, Daudet, and especially Maupassant. But it was not long before Renard had found himself and was launched upon the task of combating the unrealities even of the realistic literature of the day by making his own writing parallel as closely as possible the life about him. For (p. 40) "Renard avait horreur du faux, dans les livres comme dans la vie." G. demonstrates how Renard made it his business to strip of all the sentimentality and conventional falsehoods in which the current literature had cloaked them such subjects as the young girl, woman, love, the child, nature, peasants, and animals.

¹ *L'Œuvre et l'âme de Jules Renard*, p. 25.

This Renard achieved both in his pseudo-fictional writings, designated by G. not novels or short-stories but simply "des proses," and in his plays; in the latter, he rebelled against Brieux's "pièces à thèse" and Porto-Riche's "pièces d'amour"—"les unes et les autres étant d'après lui également éloignées de la vie" (p. 82). Thus, much of Renard's work was written with the aim to "dégager une vérité trop ensevelie sous les voiles de l'art" and seems to G. to be "une école d'équilibre et de santé" (pp. 90, 91). In the longest and meatiest chapter of his study, "l'Homme dans l'œuvre," G. shows that Renard substituted for the "mensonges" of his contemporaries material based on his own physical and spiritual experiences. All his important writings mirror either the "côté Guinry" (his life in Paris, so called because Lucien Guinry was one of his closest friends) or the "côté Chitry" (his participation in the activities of the humble village of Chitry-les-Mines in which he was reared and in which, once he had established himself in the world of letters, he spent about half of each year). Finally, G. gives us a careful analysis of the distinctively original traits of Renard's work. G.'s study is supplemented by a series of five appendices which provide a wealth of bibliographical and iconographical information. on Renard's reading, the extant manuscripts and the successive editions of his writings, critical books and articles, and the performances of his plays both in Paris and in the provinces.

G.'s complementary thesis is an elaborate examination of the illustrations of Renard's works (by such gifted artists with the pen and brush as Steinlen, Vallotton, Toulouse-Lautrec, and Bonnard, as well as by lesser craftsmen), of the two cinematographic versions of *Poil de Carotte*, and of the musical settings of several of the *Histoires naturelles* (especially that of Maurice Ravel, for which G. has the highest praise). This study, too, is furnished with an extensive bibliography, and both volumes are very well indexed. G.'s conclusions may be given in his own words. Of Renard the literary artist he says. "Epris de poésie, mais passionné de vérité, il a su garder, entre les deux, un équilibre difficile, et représenter la vie la plus profonde en des pages d'une netteté et d'une sobriété vraiment françaises et classiques" (p. 390). As for the interpretation of Renard's writings in other media, G. insists that the second cinematographic *Poil de Carotte* is, despite its good qualities, "compliqué dans son intrigue, édulcoré et simplifié dans ses caractères," and points out that the works have been illustrated most frequently in pen-and-ink but most successfully in the music of Ravel, "qui résolvait précisément le problème auquel Jules Renard avait voué son art et sa vie: être poète en restant vrai" ²

This summary of G.'s two volumes leaves little to be added. The author has treated his subject "con amore", he has had at his

² *L'Interprétation graphique etc.*, p. 173 and p. 202.

disposal all the necessary materials, including some hitherto "inédit," he has drawn a life-sized portrait of Renard as he is framed in his writings, and he has written down his findings in an eminently readable style. He has proved the inadequacy of the common conception of Renard as the author of only one significant work, *Poul de Carotte*, and he has fixed Renard's place in the stream of twentieth-century literature and art. A slight tendency to exaggerate Renard's importance and to belittle other great French writers in his favor is manifest; but this may be ascribed to zeal and certainly not to ignorance. All in all, G. has produced the definitive study of Renard.

AARON SCHAFER

The University of Texas

Ferdinand Brunetière; the Evolution of a Critic. By ELTON HOCKING. Madison, 1936. Pp. 273. (Univ. of Wis. Studies, 36.)

It is now thirty years since the death of Brunetière. So great had been his popularity, so widespread his influence that a temporary eclipse of his fame was inevitable. In the last few years critics are once more turning to him. Professor Elton Hocking of Northwestern University gives us a work which is easily the most noteworthy contribution in the last two decades. To know Brunetière thoroughly is no easy matter. It requires a great deal of reading in a field of widely varying subjects. Moreover, it requires scrupulous attention to a multitude of dates because the development of his thought is one of the most interesting features in such a study. One does not need to read very far to feel that Mr. Hocking is quite at home with his subject and, while sympathetic, ready to call attention to defects whenever he meets them.

First we have a biography in which Brunetière's work and the development of his main thought are already outlined. This method necessitates a certain amount of repetition but, on the whole, is perhaps the most satisfactory. Then, in truly classical style, the critic is studied under three headings: the traditionalist, the rationalist, the moralist, and we are told that these correspond roughly to the three periods of his productive life.

From 1875 to 1886, Brunetière is presented as working mainly under the influence of Nisard and waging relentless war on the Naturalists in the name of classical tradition. In the second period, 1886 to 1895, we see the critic building up a rational foundation for his doctrine—Schopenhauer being the guiding star. Then came the famous visit to the Vatican and the ringing proclamation of the bankruptcy of science as a substitute for religion. This last period, 1895-1906, throws Brunetière into the field of apologetics

where he meets for the most part with unexpected and bitter disappointment. During this time "he deserted the field of art for the field of action." (P. 211.) Now it is quite evident that Mr. Hocking is not the dupe of this division, but he runs the risk of giving to readers, who are not so well informed, a false idea of Brunetière's evolution. His traditionalism, which was *sui generis*, seems to me even more prominent in the latter part of his life and his interest in morality is evident in his earliest work. As Mr. Hocking remarks, "it is certain that his own philosophy of art was inseparable from his philosophy of life" (P. 134) In that philosophy, ethics always held the place of prominence. We cannot dispense with metaphysics because a stable moral code would then be impossible. This ethical preoccupation colours all Brunetière's literary criticism. "If ever there was a philosophic critic, it was Brunetière, and the criticism of his last period varied as a function of his ethics." (P. 223.) And I believe it was equally true of the second period.

When he comes to the difficult and delicate problem of Brunetière's conversion, Mr. Hocking is evidently anxious to be especially thorough and fair. On the whole, he succeeds very well. But I should like to call attention to a couple of points. He says repeatedly that faith for Brunetière was a matter of the will and not of the intellect. He points out that, in the famous speech at Lille in 1900, Brunetière distinguished carefully between what he knew and what he believed. I see nothing startling in this. St. Thomas Aquinas makes exactly the same distinction. As a matter of fact, both the intellect and the will play an essential role in faith. Another point. "social reasons" for accepting the Catholic Church may explain a Charles Maurras but scarcely a Brunetière. "I have other reasons," he said, "more personal and more intimate!" (P. 235.) And, we might add, more effective.

As to the theory of evolution, Mr. Hocking sees it as a strong influence pervading the whole of Brunetière's life and staying with him to the end. This is acceptable only if we bear in mind that he transformed the theory to suit his purpose.

A few more objections might be raised but they would not alter the fact that we have here the best single book that has yet been published on Brunetière.

L. J. BONDY

St. Michael's College, Toronto

LOPE DE VEGA, *Cancionero Teatral*. Prólogo y notas de J. ROBLES PAZOS. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1935. Pp. 114. \$1.25.

The *raison d'être* of this unpretentious collection of 138 songs

from various plays of Lope de Vega has not been precisely defined. To sheave such fascinating materials into a single book is in itself an obvious contribution to the convenience of studying an unquestionably important element of Lope's drama. And of course the mere reading of these largely popular and often traditional lyrics, even when they have been lifted from Lope's appropriate settings, affords an amenity for whose promotion one must, in all decency, be very grateful. The enjoyment of the mellow entertainment they provide against one's *momentos muertos* has been facilitated considerably by Sr. Robles' clear, quick editing. But the auspices under which he has published his work lead one to expect a far more complete, intensive and important study than at present he has cared to provide. One regrets that notwithstanding the assumption of the reader's familiarity with the genres included, Sr. Robles has seemingly preferred to cater to the Hispanistic amateur rather than to the more inquisitive and more exacting professional scholar.

Though his anthology contains some 77 items more than have been gathered by Montesinos (*Clás. Cast.*, 68), Sr. Robles has by no means attempted to make his collection complete, nor has he fixed on any appreciable basis for his apparently arbitrary process of selection. All of the songs included merit their place, but any volume of either of the Academy's editions of Lope is too rich in other *canciones*, both of intrinsic virtues and of interest as variations of generic motifs, not to compel a more exhaustive and definitive study of this attractive field on some subsequent occasion. That the editor's notes reveal his acquaintance with numerous songs which have been omitted, but which are important for their obvious relation to pieces that have been included, only teases a curiosity already taut. One is further and perhaps more keenly disappointed to find that despite the potentialities of his subject matter, Sr. Robles' 11 pages of *Prólogo* and his 10 pages of *Notas*, both rather perfunctory, embody so relatively little of consequence that has not already been noted either by Henríquez Ureña, Menéndez y Pelayo, Menéndez Pidal, Cejador, or Montesinos. Generally what Sr. Robles does say is in itself quite beyond reproach, for his remarks, elementary and limited though they may be, are always pertinent and, cautiously avoiding controversy, have closely followed the larger and deeper footprints of his authoritative predecessors. Too often, however, his notes are merely a succinct reference to fuller treatment elsewhere, and sometimes they neglect even to cite illuminating information that lies within easy reach. The utility of the whole book would have been greatly increased had the *Notas* regularly embodied cross-references to precisely those parts of the *Prólogo* of which each song is most illustrative. But a still more serious defect is that the unwary reader is left without the slightest hint that certain songs, particularly the *canciones legendarias* taken from *El caballero de Olmedo*, *Peribañez*,

Fuente Ovejuna, etc., constitute an organic part of their respective dramas and in themselves function as a technical device worthy of minute study. Sr. Robles' mere statement regarding the derivation of such plays or their songs is inadequate if not misleading. Then too one especially misses in this work some systematic effort to analyze strophic and line structure, particularly since the present classification according to general subjects (*Canciones de boda*, *Bienvenidas*, *Trébole*, etc.) or under such very elastic headings as *Seguidillas*, *Villancicos*, *Serranillas*, *Letras sacras*, or *Letras diversas* is admittedly not very exact.

Beyond the mere process of assemblage, the primary objective of this collection, and so its principal contribution, seems to have been to clarify the texts selected—to renovate their previous punctuation, correct their indubitable errors, separate their *estribillos* from their *glosas*, and methodically divide the latter into their component strophes. Sr. Robles has clearly succeeded in making his editing in many respects quite superior to that of the notoriously unsatisfactory *B. A. E.* and Academy editions, and for good measure has corrected the obvious slips of Montesinos. But even so, his texts cannot pretend to be definitive. That editorial vigilance has not sufficed to prevent the intrusion of new errors is quite understandable. But that Sr. Robles should have been satisfied to take his texts "en su mayoría de reimpresiones modernas," without specifying more exactly their provenance, leaves their authenticity a matter of conjecture and thus lamentably impairs their value. For even the song from *El cordobés valeroso Pedro Carbonero* (cxx) the original text, readily available in Montesinos' edition of the autograph manuscript (*T. A. E.*, VII, 1929, vv. 843-62), has apparently not been consulted. Surely there can be no question of the advisability of accepting Lope's own reading of *Riberitas* for *Riberitas* (1), *y en* for *en* (10), or *lástima* for *compasión* (16). But still more inexplicably inadequate is the mutilated text chosen for CXVIII (from *Lo que ha de ser*), for thereby Sr. Robles not only omits 6 lines at the end of the first stanza (*Rapacillo . . . divertirla*, Acad., N., XII, 1930, 387a), following Hartzenbusch who, as Cotarelo notes, "sólo pudo tener a la vista la defectuosa Parte xxv de 1647," but to make any sense at all he is then compelled to read, erroneously, *viéndola* instead of *viendo* at 11 and *enamorarla* instead of *enamorarle* at 12, further disagreeing with the quite superior Academy text, based on the 1614 manuscript, by reading *Salí* instead of *Sale* at 1, and at 17-19 *la niña, que yo no quiero ser Amor* instead of *niña, que no le quero, sé tu Amor*. One suspects that texts not so easily established may not have been granted much greater consideration.

In general, Sr. Robles seems to have underestimated in these songs the constancy of community participation, the almost inevitable choral quality of the *estribillo*, at which all the *Músicos*,

if not the entire company, probably joined in. Although he demonstrates in his *Prólogo* (p. 5) that he is quite aware of the two principal phenomena involved, he is not always consistent in his punctuation of those songs whose refrains are obviously sung in chorus. This is one of his most common editorial faults, and might partially be explained by his consistent omission of all speech captions in songs and dances for two participants or for chorus and soloist. In 11 instances (I, v, xx, xxvi, xli, xlii, lix, lxiii, lxix, cxix, cxi) the general purpose of clarifying texts would have been appreciably furthered by the retention of Lope's guide lines. By the same token, even in those songs whose original texts do not actually employ speech captions to mark the assumption of the refrain by general chorus, analogous breaks should regularly be indicated by additional spacing in at least iii, x, xi, xii, xx, xlii, lix, lxiii, lxiv, lxvi, lxvii, lxxii, cv, cvi, cxiv and cxxxviii.

Without a complete list of at least the 17th century variants any adequate reconstruction of Sr. Robles' texts is manifestly impossible. Tentatively, there are, in addition to the items mentioned above, some 40 questionable readings which I should prefer not to accept. To correct obvious errata, read p 4, 22, *quiere* for *guera*, iv, 3, *Premiad* for *Premiar*; v, 6, *es* for *as*; vi, 1, comma after *habéis*, xx, end, *San Isidro, Labrador de Madrid*, xxi, 1, comma after *flor* (cf. xxvi), 7, *Estas* for *Estos*, 9, *las* for *los*; xxiii, 14, *les* for *le*, xxxiv and xxxv as a single song; xxxv, 20, exclamation point; xli, 22, *Darále* for *Daralle*; xlvii, 45, comma; liv, 1, comma after *parabienes*; lix, without 27-28 (*Todo . . . así*), not part of the song itself but merely an aside by an interested auditor, and after 34, the omitted—*Pinabelo y Celia—Almendras y Amé*, lxi, end, an omitted *copla* of 16 verses (cf. Acad. viii, 426b) and a third reprise of the 5 verse *estribillo*; lxii, 45, *se* for *no*, 51, *nueva* for *nuevo*; lxiii, after 83, proper space and the omitted *Guardate, niña, del toro—Que (passim, not que) a mí mal ferido me ha* which corresponds to 72-73, 102 and 111, commas after each *parta* and semicolons after each *as*, after 102, an omitted *Toca las trompetas, as* (period) corresponding to 112 (cf. Acad. N., and Montesinos), 103, *Donde* (as at 113), 110, *abrasarás* for *abrazarás*, lxiv, 17, *miente* for *mienten*, lxv, 6, comma after *peto*, *espaldar* for *espaldas*; lxvi, 4, *favor* for *labor*, 23, without the inconsistent dash before *De* (cf. 39), 24 (and *passim*) *Panamá* for *Panama*, 57, period, 58, dash as elsewhere after *Panamá*, 89, period, 98, *que* for *Que* (cf. 74); lxvii, 35, comma after *niña*, 64, *mi* for *me*; lxix, 4, 6, 12, 14, *Vamos* for *vamos*, 6, 8, 14, dashes (cf. lxvi); lxxii, 2, *Trébole* for *trébole*; lxxvi, lxxvii and lxxviii as a single song (cf. p. 7 and lxxxiii); lxxvii, comma after *soto*; lxxxiii, 2, colon as at 10, cvi, 9, *tendrá alegría* for *podrá alegrarse*; oviii, 1, comma after *pastores* (cf. 11); cix, 1, without comma (cf. 5), 11, with comma (cf. 3); cxii, 1, *Corderita* for *Cordera*, 9, *tenéis* for *tenes*; cxviii, as does even Hartzbusch, 5, *Siguiéndola* for *Siguiéndolas*, 8, *codició* for *contempló*; cxxvi, 3, *y en* for *en*, 11, *le* for *les*; cxxviii, 8, *dos* for *las*; cxxx, 5, *Que* for *Qué*; cxxxii, 5, *pedillos* for *pedalles*; cxxxiv, 5, 7, *Cual* for *cuál*, 9, *las* for *la*; cxxxvi, title of play, *son todos* for *todos son*; cxxxvii, 10, comma after *perejil*.

L. Tieck, The German Romanticist. By EDWIN H. ZEYDEL
Princeton: Princeton University Press for the University of
Cincinnati, 1935. Pp. xvi + 406. \$3.50.

Zeydel's admirable book is a comprehensive summary of Tieck's rather neglected and misrepresented personality. The conclusions are based on a considerable amount of new and unpublished material; traditional errors in dates and facts are carefully corrected; the scientific accuracy, the extensive references to the background of his field, the skill in linking scattered notions make his critical study almost a handbook of information.

Zeydel traces the development of the poet through Rationalism, Romanticism, and Realism and fortunately emphasizes Tieck's deep connection with the so-called "Biedermeier" age (p. 275). He also puts emphasis upon the dramatic flair of some of the earliest writings. Zeydel's interpretation of *Abschied* (p. 29 ff.) marks a distinct change in the usual attitude toward *Schicksal* and *Schicksalsdrama*. He re-establishes Tieck as translator and editor of Shakespeare, he shows his intense knowledge of English literature, his very definite imprint upon the German theatre, his stimulating interest in the Middle High German period, the primarily aesthetic touch in Tieck's catholicism, the influence of mysterious forces in his writings.

For some unknown reason Zeydel did not touch more distinctly on the influence the secret societies and the trash literature of the eighteenth century had on Tieck. The researches of F. J. Schneider (*Die Freimaurerei und ihr Einfluss auf die geistige Kultur in Deutschland am Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Prag 1909) of M. Pirker (*Euphorion* xx, 261 ff.) and of M. Thalmann (*Der Trivialroman und der romantische Roman*, Berlin 1923) explored this problem pretty thoroughly, and especially Tieck's library, well-known to Zeydel (*L. Tieck and England*, 1931 and *MLN*, Jan. 1927, 21 ff.), would allow sound conclusions concerning this subject. It is surprising and at the same time instructive to know that some hundred volumes of trash literature were carefully collected by Tieck in addition to valuable editions and first printings. That cannot be explained by Tieck's dainty bibliophilism, but is one of his very personal eccentricities. The names of C. G. Cramer, J. A. Fessler, C. Grosse, A. Lafontaine, A. G. Meissner, B. Naubert, V. Weber, Mrs. Radcliffe, M. G. Lewis are distinctly connected with the first literary conception of secret societies and mysterious forces. Zeydel missed his opportunity of adding an empirical proof to the theories on romantic indebtedness to the trash literature and it is to be regretted that he did not emphasize that trait in Tieck's development.

Nevertheless, Zeydel has become Tieck's critical biographer. The

dangerous experiment, as it may seem, of basing a critical study almost entirely on facts of life turns out to be successful. Tieck's personality presented an unsolved problem. Zeydel's delightful comprehension of the problem of duality, of shifting ideas and changes in him, of opportunism and so-called chameleonism enables us to see L. Tieck's character and development as a whole, enables us to see the mind and the man. He states with outstanding honesty the weakness and the strength of the poet's personality. This approach lends to his life and writings the missing unity. The merit of Zeydel's book is to have solved the problem of a "problematic figure" and to call our attention to the "urbane style" of "a city-bred man" and "first metropolitan poet of Germany."

We have to realize that even the "mondbeglanzte Zaubernacht," the love of woods and silvery waves, the yearning for solitude, the glory of knighthood, and castle ruins are a product of metropolitan centers and reflect a metropolitan society. German literature as it has developed since those days would be unthinkable without this metropolitan spirit.

This volume supplies the requisite materials for further discussion on the subject.

MARIANNE THALMANN

Wellesley College

Widsuth. Edited by KEMP MALONE. London: Methuen and Co., 1936. Pp. xiv + 202. 10 sh. 6 d. (Methuen's Old English Library.)

The results of Professor Malone's long devotion to the elucidation of *Widsuth* are now available in a compact volume that is courageous and illuminating. It is not to be expected that all his conclusions will meet with assent; the close packed matter of the poem, our all too fragmentary knowledge of the centuries of history and story it crowds into less than a hundred and fifty lines, and the large accumulation of scholarship that has dealt with the resulting problems render finality out of the question. Appropriately dedicated to R. W. Chambers to whom all students of *Widsuth* are so deeply indebted, the present volume has conclusions of its own to offer, both as to the growth and the structure of the poem and the identity of some of the kings and peoples whose memory it enshrines.

Developing the views of Brandl and Heusler, Professor Malone sees as the oldest matter in the poem the three catalogues, each with its peculiar formula, one of peoples, one of rulers and their peoples, and a third of names not limited, in the view which Professor Malone sensibly adopts, to the retainers of Eormannric. In these he finds very little that is not genuine old stuff of the sixth

century. Such unpromising folk as the Moide, Perse, Amothingas and (M)ofdingas are with varying plausibility identified as Germanic tribes; Beadeca and Hehca become credible kinsmen of Eormanric, only the obviously classical names in lines 82-83 and lines 34, 114, and 118, because their pattern differs from the stark regularity that surrounds them, are marked as interpolations.

These three lists Professor Malone then conceives to have come to the hand of an English poet of the late seventh century, who prepared for them a carefully balanced setting, an introduction and a conclusion, rounding out the first with the freely composed episodes of Offa and Heorot and the third with similar episodes of Wulfhere, Wudga, and Hama. From the formulas "*ic wæs mid*" and "*sohte ic*" the poet caught the idea of a long-lived minstrel into whose mouth he places the whole expanded poem and who in the second section celebrates his own prowess in song and the rewards he received at the hands of Guthere the Burgundian, Aelfwine (Alboin) the Lombard, and Eormanric the Goth and the lady Ealhild.

With Ealhild scholars have had their difficulties. Was she a princess of the Myrgings, Widsith's own people, or a daughter of Audoin (Eadwine) and so sister of Alboin the Lombard, and was it in her train, the destined bride of Eormanric, that Widsith journeyed? The poem has been understood in both ways, and from either interpretation it follows that there was an old poem in which Widsith, Ealhild, and Eormanric and his retainers were inextricably associated, the authentic *Widsith*. This view Professor Malone boldly discards. By interpreting *mid Ealhilde* (l. 5) as modifying, not *he*, but *Hreðcyninges ham*, he makes Ealhild the wife of Eormanric, so to speak, *ealle þrage*, at whose court on his first and most memorable journey Widsith was received by her, sang before her, and bore away his reward. Not everyone will feel certain that the text can support this construction, though Professor Malone cites parallels. If he is right in this and in understanding *wraþes wærlogan* as "hostile to treaty breakers," thus avoiding dispraise of Eormanric who is later praised, then it must be admitted that Professor Malone has built up a clear and consistent interpretation of the most ancient poetical monument in our language that increases our respect for the poet who put it together as a skilful handler of his materials and for the materials themselves as representing on the whole what was truly remembered of early times. The editor's copiously and ingeniously applied learning, seeking always to explain the text as it stands rather than to amend or to suspect interpolation, does make of it a more intelligible and a better poem. The fulness of the textual notes, the bibliography, and the glossary of proper names furnish all that is needed on which to base doubt or disagreement; but there can be neither doubt nor disagreement over the fact that

Professor Malone has handled difficult matters thoroughly and stimulatingly, and made a distinguished advance in a long and honorable scholarly tradition.

HARRY MORGAN AYRES

Columbia University

Die Weltanschauung Jonathan Swifts. By MAX ARMIN KORN. Jena: Biedermann, 1935. Pp. 143. M. 6.75. (Forschungen zur Englischen Philologie, 4.)

Jonathan Swift. Gedanken und Schriften über Religion und Kirche. By HANS REIMERS. Hamburg: Friederichsen, de Gruyter, 1935. Pp. 194. M. 8 50. (Britannica, 9.)

The Letters of Jonathan Swift to Charles Ford. Edited by DAVID NICHOL SMITH. Oxford: The Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford University Press], 1935. Pp. xlviii + 260. \$5 00.

The Drapier's Letters to the People of Ireland. Edited by HERBERT DAVIS. Oxford: The Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford University Press], 1935. Pp. xcvi + 400. \$7.00.

Die Weltanschauung Jonathan Swifts is a very interesting attempt at a comprehensive statement of Swift's intellectual significance. The chief importance of this monograph lies not so much in the definitions which it offers,—for with certain of these one must take issue,—as in the author's attitude: he approaches his subject in an admirable spirit, for he is aware of Swift's seriousness, of the many facets of Swift's thought, and of the fact that there are far-reaching historical implications.

Of the five chapters of this book, those treating of Swift's position regarding Church and State (III), Swift's social and political thought (IV), and Swift's historical assumptions and consciousness (V) are thorough-going and sound. But the crucial chapter is the second—"Gott und Mensch (Das religionsphilosophische Weltbild)." Here one finds Swift's anti-intellectualism, his hatred of enthusiasm, his ethical seriousness, and his pessimism regarding mankind clearly identified; and it is in relation to these that his religious thought and his attitude towards man are defined. One becomes uncomfortable only when the author seeks to explain Swift against the background of European thought. Particularly inept are the pages devoted to the history of sceptical and pessimistic thought; and one passage (p. 46), in which Swift's Houyhnhnms are brought into relation with Montaigne, calls aloud for detailed and emphatic correction.

Swift's religion is a subject from which the biographers and critics of the great Dean have been in the habit of shying away, usually

contenting themselves with a few sweeping observations that reach nowhere. A few years ago, it is true, a certain English writer ventured to close with this subject, but the ineptitude of certain of his remarks—he maintained that the *Project For The Advancement of Religion* is ironic throughout—merely emphasized the extraordinary difficulties which Swift's religious position holds even for those possessing special knowledge of the Augustan Age. *Jonathan Swift Gedanken und Schriften uber Religion und Kirche* is not only the most comprehensive treatment of Swift's religion thus far to appear, but as a critical and historical study it is well-considered, assured, and ripe.

In the course of his book the author summarizes and analyzes almost all of Swift's writings on religion and the Church, and never once, it should be said, does he mistake Swift's tone or miss the subtle shades of meaning. It is apropos of his general observations on the intellectual history of the times and Swift's relations thereto that one would like to argue with him—not to challenge roundly, not to refute in any downright manner, but in behalf now of a somewhat different interpretation of the thought of the period and again of a different emphasis upon certain of Swift's attitudes. For instance, a sharper definition of the characteristic rationalism of the Enlightenment would bring out more fully the significance of Swift's hatred of enthusiasm—so important in his treatment of Dissenters—and of his anti-intellectualism—the basis of his formal religious position. (Here, too, one could get at the error which lies in the observation, p. 37, that in *The Battle of the Books* Swift was in opposition to the spirit of the Enlightenment because he attacked science.) One would like to break down the sharp contrast which the writer develops between Swift "the rationalist," withholding assent to the dogmas of his Church, and Swift the practical moralist, fervently conforming to the Church as a social institution. But most of all one would like to insist that Swift's attitude towards the Church—he was a Tory devoted to the Church rather than a High Churchman—is to be understood only by observing how in his religious pamphlets of 1708-1709 he strove to define for himself a position lying mid-way between the extreme State-Church of the violent Whigs and the equally extreme Church-State of the resurgent Queen Anne Tories.

The two splendid volumes recently issued by the Clarendon Press—Professor D. Nichol Smith's edition of Swift's letters to Charles Ford, and Professor Davis's edition of the *Drapier's Letters*—are permanent additions to the essential library of every student of Swift. It would be superfluous to hold forth upon the high order of scholarship which the editors have brought to their respective tasks. It will be enough to point out the general significance of these two volumes and to mention the more important facts which Professors Smith and Davis have brought to light in the course of their researches.

Swift and Charles Ford, an Englishman born in Ireland, became friends before the end of 1707, and from then on they saw much of one another and corresponded until the late 1730's, by which time Ford had ceased to reside in Ireland and had established himself for good in London. Of the letters which passed between them comparatively few have hitherto been known: eighteen from Ford to Swift were printed in the eighteenth century and reprinted by F. Elrington Ball in the *Correspondence*; but of Swift's letters to Ford, Ball gave only one in full (June 22, 1736) and fragments from two others (June 29, 1733 and [August 10, 1733]). The correspondence now edited by Professor Smith consists of fifty letters from Swift to Ford, of which only that of June 22, 1736, has previously been printed—for the sake of completeness Professor Smith includes the eighteen known letters from Ford to Swift. These new letters of Swift extend from the close of 1708 down to June, 1736. The most interesting are those which Swift wrote in June, July, and August, 1714, when he was observing from his retreat in Letcombe the death-throes of the Tory Ministry, and those of 1721, '22, '24, and '25, in which he commented upon his progress with *Gulliver's Travels*. However, save for their disclosures concerning the composition of *Gulliver's Travels*, these letters add nothing of first importance to our knowledge of the details of Swift's life and work. Thus, what he wrote to Ford during the weeks preceding and following the Queen's death brings us closer to the breathless events then being enacted, but tells us little that we did not know before. And again, although Ford was probably the only one of Swift's friends who knew all the facts concerning both Stella and Vanessa,—Stella and Mrs. Dingley, it will be remembered, spent the summer following Vanessa's death (1723) with Ford at the latter's Irish residence, Woodpark,—the correspondence throws no light upon the history of either woman. Nevertheless, no seasoned student of Swift will regard these letters as disappointing, for they afford precisely what is most needed for a sane estimate of the author—insight into his every-day kindness, charm, and good-sense. The misconception of Swift the man which began with Orrery, found classical expression in Thackeray's lecture, and still appears in preposterous critical studies like *Swift or The Egoist* is not going to last forever. Its disappearance will be hastened by *The Letters of Jonathan Swift to Charles Ford*.

It is a stroke of the greatest luck that while he was writing *Gulliver's Travels* Swift kept Ford posted regarding the progress of the work, for had he not done so the history of the composition of the great satire would probably never have been known. Since 1919, when Sir Charles Firth delivered his famous paper on "The Political Significance of *Gulliver's Travels*" (*Proceedings of The British Academy*, 1919-1920), the essential facts have been acces-

sible to students, and in 1926 they were restated by Mr. Harold Williams in his Introduction to the reprint of the first edition of *G's. T.* It gives one great satisfaction, nevertheless, to have at one's command for the first time the actual source of this new information.

In addition to the letters themselves, Professor Smith gives for the first time Ford's Latin verses for Stella's birthday in 1726, Ford's Latin poem for Swift's birthday in 1727, and the two poems—hitherto garbled into one—which Swift wrote on the occasion of Stella's visit at Woodpark in 1723. And on the basis of the correspondence it is shown that the *Enquiry into the Behaviour of the Queen's Last Ministry* was not finished till 1721, that *The Right of Precedence between Physicians and Civilians* must be removed from the Swift canon, and that Swift's authorship of *The Puppet Show* is questionable.

Professor Davis's edition of the *Drapier's Letters* is a magnificent piece of work. How badly such an edition was needed has long been apparent. Though the great services rendered by Temple Scott as editor of the collected *Prose Works* will never be forgotten, his labours must be regarded as having but pointed the way to future editors. The Smith and Guthkelch edition of *A Tale of A Tub* and *The Battle of the Books* (1920) may be said to represent the first volume of the definitive edition of Swift's prose writings. The second volume is this containing the *Drapier's Letters*. In time, it is devoutly to be hoped, other volumes will follow, for there is much to be done—especially to be desired is a new edition of the political writings and the pamphlets on Church and State.

Thanks to Professor Davis's exhaustive researches, we now have for the first time the full and accurate history of the *Drapier's Letters* and the events which called them forth. The *First Letter*, which previously was believed to have been issued in April, 1724, was planned and written as early as February, though it may not have been printed until March. Regarding its composition, it seems that Swift had more advice from his friends than has hitherto been suspected. Concerning the *Second Letter* (early August), the *Third* (late August), and the *Fourth* (*A Letter to the Whole People of Ireland*, ptd. Oct. 22) there has never been much confusion, but there has been a great deal in regard to the events which took place in the following November. At Carteret's insistence the Privy Council, on Oct. 27, began the prosecution of Harding, the printer of the *Fourth Letter*, and issued a Proclamation against the Drapier. Swift, who was secretly informed of the deliberations of the Council, now wrote the *Letter to Lord Chancellor Midleton* (dated Oct. 26, but first ptd. as *Letter VI* in *Swift's Works*, vol. iv, 1735), but was dissuaded from publishing it. On November 14, however, he distributed through the post his *Seasonable Advice*, addressed to the Grand Jury before whom

Harding's case was to come. But Harding was never prosecuted; instead, the government attempted to obtain a presentment of the *Seasonable Advice*, and it was the Jury's refusal to find this paper of a seditious nature that caused its dismissal by Lord Chief Justice Whitshed. A new Grand Jury was summoned, but when on the last day of the term (Sat., Nov. 28) it was given an opportunity of making a presentment of the *Seasonable Advice*, it made instead a presentment "of all such persons as have attempted, or shall endeavour by fraud or otherwise, to impose the said halfpence upon us"—for this presentment Swift himself was probably directly responsible. The *Fifth Letter*, addressed to Lord Molesworth, appeared Dec. 31. The last *Letter* (ptd. as *Letter VII* in the *Works*, 1735) was written during the summer of 1725, but with the news of the surrender of the Patent its publication was abandoned.

This, very briefly, is the newly revealed history of the *Drapier's Letters*. Unfortunately, nothing can here be said of Professor Davis's notes and appendices, which are almost as exciting as his Historical Introduction.

RICARDO QUINTANA

The University of Wisconsin

Georgic Tradition in English Poetry. By DWIGHT L. DURLING.

New York: Columbia University Press, 1935. Pp. xii + 259.

\$3.00. (Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, CXXI.)

Aspects of Eighteenth-Century Nature Poetry. By C. V. DEANE.

Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1935. Pp. 145. 7sh. 6d.

The Sublime: a Study of Critical Theories in XVIII-Century

England. By SAMUEL H. MONK. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1935. Pp. viii + 252. (Modern Language Association General Series.)

Enthusiasm in English Poetry of the Eighteenth Century (1700-

1774). By SISTER M. K. WHELAN. Washington, D. C.:

Catholic University of America, 1935. Pp. viii + 169.

(Catholic University of America dissertation.)

In his *Georgic Tradition in English Poetry*, Mr. Durling traces the history of a once popular and long-lived genre, illustrating with a wealth of material the vogue and transformations of the type. He is thus able to show the work of important writers like Thomson and Cowper in clearer perspective, and even to make some pertinent suggestions about nineteenth-century poetry. In

addition, he explains in terms of the prevailing ideas modifications in the traditional themes.

It is not likely that Mr. Durling has missed many relevant items in his study, yet the plan of presentation comes very close to converting opulence into a condition of want amidst plenty. His practice of giving in chronological order a brief account of nearly every poem that falls within his established categories results in a series of independent essays, rather loosely classified, in which anything might be included that can be said about the poem considered by itself, even though it does not necessarily follow that all this will be relevant to a study of the genre as such. Moreover, where the history of ideas is involved, no consistency is maintained since the various threads are followed intermittently in connection with particular poems. Mr. Durling further complicates his problems by being too regularly the informal critic as well as the historian, for, theoretical objections aside, the former rôle is frequently an embarrassment: nothing much is gained by frequent recital of such observations as that "Dinsdale is an indifferent versifier," "Tighe is fatally diffuse," etc. Discussion of dull writings can be made interesting only by means of striking interpretative ideas. Critical recognition of the dullness, an attitude of indulgence, even occasional whimsicality, help merely as palliatives. Mr. Durling's account often reads like a brave Odyssey through the Lotos Land of ennui and the Hades of dead poems; and although it contains much valuable information and comment, it seems rather a monument to the industrious worthies who believed too naively that in the imitation of an ancient traditional form there was artistic security, and that poetry should instruct though with pleasure.

Mr. Deane's study of eighteenth century nature poetry escapes some of these difficulties, for the aim being primarily critical appreciation, only those specimens of such poetry are considered which illustrate the art of this style at its best. Mr. Deane takes the cue for his estimates of this poetry from the two most frequently raised objections against it—its conventional diction, and its confusion of the distinct provinces of painting and poetry. He considers the manner in which conventional diction may be used as an aid in generalizing the description and as background for the local touches, and he shows that the conventional devices are not inimical to exact observations of nature. In disputing the common criticism that eighteenth-century nature poets confused the arts of poetry and painting, Mr. Deane argues, on the one hand, that the recent theories concerning the influence of picturesque painting on descriptive verse distort matters by considering inferior as well as good poetry on the same level, and, on the other, that Lessing's objections to "static" descriptions of nature are unsatisfactory on theoretical grounds or on practical ones too when applied to many examples of such poetry. These are the main features of an in-

teresting attempt to provide a basis for a better understanding of a much abused style of poetry. Mr. Deane is best in occasional intelligently appreciative remarks. On the theoretical side he raises uncertainties. At times he wishes these poets viewed in terms of "what they set out to do," and at others he eschews the relativistic position in the search for their "absolute merits"; and, although for the most part the latter position dominates, he never quite makes it clear in terms of what critical principles these "absolute merits" are to be measured.

On the theoretical problems of eighteenth-century literature, Samuel Monk's work on the sublime is an important addition. The discussions of the sublime during the eighteenth century touch on almost every phase of critical theory and taste, and the task of dealing with the various ramifications and developments of this important current of esthetic speculation is considerable. Moreover, the writers on the sublime are not for the most part to be admired for their clarity and consistency. It is therefore no inconsiderable achievement that Mr. Monk's treatment of this conception and of its related ideas is on the whole discriminating and clear.

In order to give some directing focus to his study, Mr. Monk devotes his introduction largely to an analysis of Kant's theory of the sublime, as a kind of limit toward which the discussions of the eighteenth century might be thought to be approaching. Fortunately, he generally disregards this point of focus, and the fact that he escapes serious errors in perspective as a result of a teleological approach in a field so wide shows that the device is not essential to his plan. Indeed, he is the first to be concerned lest he oversimplify too much and thus through the need of organizing "give to the subject a symmetry that is entirely false." Any organization, however, does violence to the actualities of any moment in history, and a greater rigidity of form might have helped to eliminate some of the needless repetition and lack of emphasis which sometimes result from the chronologically arranged summaries of separate works.

For the eighteenth century, the sublime, according to Mr. Monk, became a welcome theoretical justification for many vagaries of taste which did not fit into the strictly neo-classical scheme. This view, though not incorrect, tends to obscure an important distinction. For one thing, it emphasizes unduly the inflexibility of the older esthetic theories. The variety of meanings implicit in the normative term "nature," the relativism occasionally admitted on racial, nationalistic, or climatic grounds, the distinction made or implied by certain critics between the general ideal of rule and "the rules," etc., permitted considerable extension of the scope of the standard doctrines. It is significant that, without departing in any basic philosophical respects from the traditional theories,

Johnson was able to defend Shakespeare from many of the criticisms which those very theories had raised against his plays. The inference to be drawn is not that Mr. Monk exaggerates the distinction between the two schools of esthetics, but that in spite of neglecting the possibility for subtleties in the one, he never establishes sharply the philosophical differences between them. The serious limitation of the idea of the sublime as a critical principle is that it cannot, strictly speaking, concern itself with a work of art as an organic whole, for it applies only to those occasional experiences for which the term "sublime," however defined, can be applied. Accordingly, the theory relates to special aspects only of a work of art, or to the object of imitation suggested by it, or to the moral or psychological structure of man and his response to great objects or ideas. How far these considerations separate the idea of the sublime from much of neo-classical criticism can be seen by comparing Johnson's assertion that Shakespeare's greatness is not in the splendor of particular passages but in the progress of his fable, with Blair's statement that the utmost we can expect is that sublimity may flash upon us occasionally like lightning.

Such reservations, however, should not be allowed to weigh too heavily against the value of Mr. Monk's study. It is rich in information and full of illuminating suggestions; it represents a useful and interesting contribution to an important question.

An analogous, though more restricted, territory is surveyed in Sister Whelan's book on enthusiasm. This study shows familiarity with the scholarship and the original materials, but not much acuteness in dealing with ideas. For example, the author interprets the assertion that reason is secondary to faith though an aid to it, a common Anglican compromise, as a revolt against religious formalism; primitivism, because it appears in "enthusiastic" poetry, she considers a necessary symptom of romanticism, she asserts the influence of Shaftesbury frequently and uncritically. She does not distinguish between conventional themes and individual sentiments (*cf.* "Solitude and Retirement"). She takes no account of benevolism and the cult of sensibility. And such confusions are intensified by the author's search for early traces of romanticism, a pursuit which, in view of her familiarity with recent scholarship, we might have expected to find conducted with less zeal and more wisdom.

M. E. PRIOR

Northwestern University

The Works of Thomas Lovell Beddoes. Edited with an Introduction by H. W. DONNER. London [and New York]: Oxford University Press. 1935. Pp. lxi + 834. \$8.75.

Mr. Donner, the third of Beddoes's important editors, admits the value of the work done by the first, which indicates his honesty in a confused field. He acknowledges that we owe to Kelsall biographical facts and the text which preserved Beddoes from oblivion. Mr. Donner's own contribution is three-fold. He has had access to the transcripts allegedly made in 1886 by Dykes Campbell of the material which vanished with the famous "Browning Box" at the time of "Pen" Browning's death in Asolo. On page 691 *et seq.* and page 791 and in the Introduction (li) he describes this material and Dykes Campbell's method of transcription. From the material Mr. Donner is able to present approximately one hundred hitherto unpublished pieces or fragments. These do not present a new Beddoes but when one considers that Gosse's edition of 1890 produced ten new pieces, and his edition of 1929 added little beyond the juvenile *Scaroni* and one letter written when Beddoes was aged fourteen, the interest of Mr. Donner's contribution becomes obvious. More important, however, Mr. Donner has published the Variorum edition of *Death's Jest-Book* which Sir Edmund Gosse stated was available and did not publish. On page 321 Mr. Donner dates and numbers the Mss. and from there proceeds to print his Variorum. A comparison with the Kelsall text compels one to admiration of Kelsall's ingenuity in making sense of and preserving most of the best of the poetry of his rather mad and careless friend. Taking Act I, Scene III as an example, one finds that from Mss. III (dated between 1838 and 1844) Kelsall at the start has removed two lyrics and a blank verse passage which duly appear in his edition as independent units (Kelsall I, 171; I, 119; I, 191) Kelsall then proceeds with the scene, and a hasty collation of his text with Mr. Donner's variorum shows that although Kelsall was professedly following the latest text (Mss. III 1838-44) he actually opened with thirty-nine lines from Mss. II (1829). He then shifted to Mss. III for his main text but there are about twenty to twenty-five variants (twenty-two was my figure but I collated hastily), Kelsall sometimes substituting words or phrases from Mss. II for those of Mss. III, sometimes merely deleting from Mss. III. Mr. Donner has therefore made available for the scholar the material with which Kelsall worked, but Beddoes, to the intelligent reading public, will remain Kelsall's creation—his editorial "doctoring" of the text appearing to be clearly justified by the material and the result.

Mr. Donner's second contribution is his attack on the German field, and his third is the addition of some ten hitherto unpublished letters. The German material confirms what was already

known of Beddoes's political opinions. It is therefore no surprise, but it is the first concrete body of material to be reprinted, and it includes both prose and poetry. Of the new letters eight are trivial, XLV and LVI with the material given in the notes (pp. 770, 773-4) throw new light on Beddoes's difficulties in Würzburg in 1832 and Zurich in 1839. An important satire in German (p. 145 *et seq.*) should be noted in this connection.

ROYALL H. SNOW

Ohio State University

Studies in Early Celtic Nature Poetry. By KENNETH JACKSON.

Cambridge: at the University Press, and New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935. Pp. xii + 204. \$3.75.

The first section of Mr. Jackson's book is devoted to translations of what, as he says, "has come to be called the 'early Celtic nature poetry.'" These are Irish and Welsh poems of the early period "up to about the twelfth and thirteenth centuries."¹ Many of the poems have never been properly translated, some have never been translated at all. Mr. Jackson has made his own translations of all of them, and in so doing he has had the advice and assistance of distinguished Welsh and Irish scholars, so that it may safely be assumed that the translations are as accurate as the present stage of Celtic scholarship permits. In the notes to the Irish poems he refers to works in which the original texts are printed, gives us the probable dates and the context, and discusses the earlier translations and his departures from them. For the Welsh poems he gives the dates but, except in two cases, no other references except to his recent *Early Welsh Gnommic Poems*. It would have been convenient if he had repeated here at least his references to works printing the original texts.

The second and larger part of the book is devoted to a discussion of the poems. Mr. Jackson holds that these poems do not constitute a class of nature poetry, that they are of diverse origins, and that many of them are not, properly speaking, nature poetry at all. His object is to determine "what really are the different kinds of poetry that have been included under this name, what sort of people composed them, and what was their purpose." The truest nature poetry he finds to be the production of the Irish hermits of the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries. The hermit lived close to nature and felt himself in harmony with it because both he and it were communing with God. Next come the elegiac poems in which

¹ Yet two of the Irish poems he dates as fourteenth century or later, and three more as fifteenth or sixteenth century; one of the Welsh poems he places in the last half of the fifteenth century.

the speaker, usually an old man, laments the hardships which he must suffer in his exile, and the Fenian poems which describe the glories and joys of the Fiana, and lament their loss. Somewhat more objective are the seasonal poems which center, for the most part, about the beginning of summer and the beginning of winter. It seems probable, although the external evidence is weak, that these developed from the seasonal festivals of *Céttamain* (*Kalan Mei*) and *Samhain* (*Kalan Gaeaf*). Continental literature affords interesting parallels but they are too late to have had any influence upon these Irish and Welsh poems. In Welsh we have also a type of gnomic poetry in which nature gnomes are found mixed with human gnomes. Mr. Jackson's theory of its development is too complex to be summed up here in a few words.

A study of the book leaves me with the feeling that, while it may not be correct to speak of Celtic nature poetry *per se*, yet the Celt of the early Middle Ages was apt to look upon nature with more pleasure and more sympathy than his neighbors did. Mr. Jackson feels this too, but he does not stress the point since his concern is to study the different types in which this feeling manifests itself. In so doing he brings out many things that are of interest to the student of Celtic poetry and to the student of poetry in general. But it is probable that long after his discussions have been digested we will continue to turn back to the book for the sake of the poems themselves.

University of Illinois

JOHN J. PARRY

BRIEF MENTION

De Quincey at Work. By WILLIARD HALLAM BONNER. Pp. 111. \$0.50. (The University of Buffalo Studies, XI, April, 1936. Monographs in English, 2.) This volume contains some 130 letters; all, but one to Hessey in 1823, falling within the last decade of De Quincey's life. About 100 are those curious notes from De Quincey to the Hogs while they were publishing *Selections Grave and Gay*; all but one or two of the rest were written by De Quincey's daughters to Mr. and Mrs. James T. Fields and to some of the men connected with Ticknor and Fields while *De Quincey's Writings* were appearing in Boston. Altogether they give a vivid picture of De Quincey's last years—of his habits, attitudes and moods; and the letters of the daughters are not the least interesting. Most of this material sees light here for the first time, except for a few of the Hogg notes published by Japp and, almost synchronously with Professor Bonner's book, by me in my *Thomas De Quincey*.

Professor Bonner wisely prints the Fields correspondence as a unit; and in a separate section arranges the Hogg letters as far as possible chronologically. But most of these are undated, and Dr. Bonner has shown much ingenuity in bringing them to order. He has also written excellent introductions and notes.

De Quincey at Work is so good in general plan and execution that one wishes it were better in detail. One would have liked to know where the original of each letter may be found. We are merely told that originals are preserved in the Huntington Library, in the Buffalo Public Library, in my collection, etc. But a greater defect lies in the carelessness with which the letters are printed. The punctuation, in so far as I have checked with my own MSS., is very inaccurate; too many words have been dropped out in transcribing; and in certain places misreadings of the MS. occur—as, for example on page 88, where “Reputations” is twice given for “Refutations.” But these are obviously merely signs of haste in preparation, and we are all “vulnerable.” In spite of minor faults, the little book is valuable for the De Quincey specialist.

HORACE A. EATON

Syracuse University

The History of the English Novel. Vol. 7, *The Age of Dickens and Thackeray.* By ERNEST A. BAKER. London: H. F. & G. Witherby, 1936. Pp. 404. Sh. 16. This work grows monumental, and bids fair to reach a tenth volume before its conclusion. It might readily exceed that limit if its author were disposed to give to contemporary fiction the same amplitude of reference that he has devoted to the fiction of the past. We incline to the view that he will wisely refrain from that attempt, for his method leans upon authoritative opinion, and the modern chaos would confuse him. He has neither the jauntiness nor the courage of his predecessor, Saintsbury, and is less competent to generate views of his own.

But his lack of originality, though it may bring less refreshment to his pages, does not seriously impair the value of the work he has grimly determined to perform. We referred somewhat too hastily to his lack of courage. The incentive of pleasure might lead one to sift the winnowed masterpieces of the past, but only a brave man could venture among the graveyard remains of the dead centuries. His desire for thoroughness at all cost has made Dr. Baker less entertaining but definitely more valuable to the student of literature, who will learn from these pages what he may profitably avoid.

If there is nothing more dead than a dead book there is nothing more vital than a live one, and if we must make an adverse comment upon Dr. Baker's achievement it is that with respect to the admittedly great writers whom he presents he is not markedly

Marionettes in the North of France. By REGINALD S. SIBBALD. Philadelphia: 1936. Pp. x + 134. Univ. of Pa. diss. The first third of this work is a résumé of marionette history as recounted by Magnin, Campardon, Maindron, and others; the rest of it is devoted to the marionette theaters of Amiens, Lille, and Roubaix, more especially to the activities of Louis Richard and his son Léopold, who have composed some 800 pieces for this form of entertainment. Dr. S. knows his subject well and presents it in an interesting manner. He brings out clearly the popular character of the marionette-shows in the north, whose authors appear to have been unaffected by the notice taken of them at Paris. While he notes connections with Belgian marionettes, he denies that they had any influence on Maeterlinck and publishes (pp. 4, 5) a letter in which the dramatist assures him of that fact. I would suggest that the name La Fleur, given to the principal marionette of Amiens, may have some connection with the Parisian theater of the seventeenth century, as the name was then employed by two prominent actors of the Hôtel de Bourgogne. Dr. S. may also be interested to learn that marionettes dance a ballet and play a farce in the midst of Poisson's *Après-Soupe* (pub., 1665) and that Mayolas mentions a parody of Boyer's *Jupiter et Sémélé* that was given at Paris in February, 1666, by Francizin and his marionettes.

H. C. L.

Die Narrenspiele des neuentdeckten Mischbands von Trepperel-drucken. By P. H. AUG BECKER. Leipzig: Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse, Band 87, Heft 2, 1935. Pp. 52. 2 RM. This is a study of the *Sotties* edited by E. Droz in 1935. Although a needlessly large amount of space is devoted to summarizing the plays and repeating the words of the editor regarding them, and although some of the "Verbesserungen" proposed by B. seem otiose and purely conjectural, nevertheless students of the late mediaeval theatre will find here various apposite generalizations, pertinent remarks about the dates of the plays and acceptable emendations of the texts.

G. F.

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

1885-1937

The editors of MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES would express their sorrow over the death of Gustav Gruenbaum and their deep appreciation of the services he rendered both to the review and to the Johns Hopkins. Born at Bucharest in 1885, he received his early education there, attending the University of Bucharest, where one of his teachers was the distinguished historian, Nicholas Jorga. He came to this country early in 1904, received his Ph. D. degree at the Johns Hopkins in 1911, was instructor in that University until 1917, associate until 1926, associate professor until his sudden death on February 1, 1937. He was especially interested in the great Italian Classics, but he gave courses also in later Italian literature, in Italian dialects and historical grammar, in Old Spanish, and in Rumanian. He had collected a library of some ten thousand books, perhaps the most valuable private library dealing chiefly with Italian in the country. He became an associate editor of MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES in 1917, devoting his energies mainly to the Italian portion of the review. His knowledge of the Romance languages was extensive and profound. He was an admirable teacher, who won the devotion of his students as few are able to do. He set for himself a very high ideal of scholarship and rarely offered an opinion that he could not substantiate. He was eager to establish his facts, to interpret them, and to present his conclusions with scrupulous accuracy, while avoiding anything that might be understood as intended to advertise the interpreter. If he did not attain as a productive scholar the success that he had as a teacher, it was largely because intense self-criticism staid his hand. He had undertaken to publish two extensive studies in the field of the Italian Renaissance. If he had completed these, he would doubtless have made many others realize, as do his colleagues and students only too well, the loss that American scholarship has suffered in his death.

H. C. L.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received]

Ainsworth, E. G., Jr.—Poor Collins. His life, his art, and his influence *Ithaca*: Cornell U. Press, 1937 Pp. xii + 340. \$3.00.

Brown, Charles.—Some Letters & Miscellanea of —, the friend of John Keats and Thomas Richards, ed M. B. Forman. *London* [and N. Y.]: Oxford Univ. Press, 1937. Pp. xvi + 146 \$3.00

Buck, G.—In Fortsetzung Bagehofs Die Waverley-Romane Sir Walter Scotts Pp. 24 M 2 (Reprinted from Schutt item, below.)

Buhler, Willi.—Die "Erlebte Rede" im englischen Roman. *Zurich*: Max Niehan (1937) Pp. 183 Swiss Fr. 6.50 (Swiss Studies in English, 4)

Bush, Douglas.—Mythology and the Romantic tradition in Eng poetry *Cambridge*: Harvard Univ Press, 1937. Pp. xvi + 647 (Harvard Stud. in Eng, 18)

Crofts, J.—Shakespeare and the Post Horses *Bristol*: Arrowsmith, 1937. Pp. 231. 10 sh (U of Bristol Studies, 5)

Ebisch, W., and Schücking, L. L.—Sup (1930-35) to a Shakespeare bibliog. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [N. Y.: Oxford Press], 1937 Pp. 104 \$1.75.

Flory, C. R.—Economic Criticism in American Fiction, 1792-1900. U of Pa. diss., 1936. Pp. 261.

Hawkins, Wm.—Apollo Shroving, ed. H. G. Rhoads. U of Pa. diss., 1936 Pp. 197.

McIver, C. S.—W S Maugham technique and literary sources. U. of Pa. diss., 1936. Pp. 102.

Milton.—L'Alegro, Il Penseroso et Samson Agonistes, trad F. Delattre *Paris*: Aubier, 1937 Pp. xciv + 161 + xv.

—Paradise regained, the minor poems, and Samson Agonistes, ed. M. Y. Hughes. *New York*: Doubleday, Doran, 1937. Pp. lxiv + 633. \$1.00.

Olivero, F.—Beowulf, trad. de l'ital par C Monnet. *Turin*: Lattes, 1937 Pp. clx + 257

Schutt, Gretton, Mau, etc.—Britannica, 13 *Hamburg*: Friederichsen, de Gruyter, 1936. Pp. 318 M 12

Shakespeare.—Macbeth, éd. M. Castelain. *Paris*: Aubier, 1937. Pp. xlii + 163.

Spoerni, W. T.—The Old World and the New, current European views on American civilization. *Zurich*: Max Niehan (1937).

Pp. 237. Swiss Fr. 6.50. (Swiss Studies in Eng., 3.)

Winters, Yvor.—Primitivism and Decadence, a study of American experimental poetry. *New York*: Arrow eds., 1937. Pp. xiv + 146.

Yost, C. D. Jr.—The Poetry of the *Gentleman's Magazine* U of Pa. diss., 1936. Pp. 147.

Young, G. M.—Victorian England *London* [and N. Y.]: Oxford Univ. Press, 1936 213 pp \$3.00

GERMAN

Altenkirch, Josef.—Die Namen der Gemarkungen Bingen und Budesheim. Diss *Giessen* [S.-A. aus Flurnamenbuch des Volksstaats Hessen H. 9]. *Giessen*: v Munchow, 1936 78 pp.

Barnes, Bertram.—Goethe's Knowledge of French Literature [Oxford Studies in Modern Languages and Literature] *New York*: Oxford Press, 1937 viii, 172 pp. \$3.50

Bieder, Theobald.—Adolf Stern und seine Beziehungen zu Friedrich Hebbel. Hrsg. im Auftrag der Hebbel-Gemeinde Mit unschriftlicher Wiedergabe von 6 Briefen. *Berlin*: Behr's Verlag, 1937. 40 pp. M. 2.50.

Bindewald, Helene.—Deutsche Texte aus schlesischen Kanzleien des 14. u. 15. Jhs. Auf Grund der Vorarbeiten Konrad Burdachs unter seiner u. Paul Piurs Mitwirkung herausgegeben. *Halte 2* [Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation. Bd. 9, Halte 2] *Berlin*: Weidmann, 1936 Pp. 259-445 M 14

Castelle, Friedrich.—Löns-Gedenkbuch Neue Bearbeitung. Mit 15 Abb *Bad Pyrmont*: Gersbach [1936] 257 pp. M 4.80.

Christa, Johann.—Wörter und Wendungen der Prümer Mundart. *Prüm, Rheinland*: 1935. 32 pp.

Cucuel, Ernst.—Die Eingangsbücher des Parzival und das Gesamtwerk Diss *Heidelberg* [Deutsche Forschungen. Bd. 30]. *Frankfurt a. M.*: Diesterweg, 1937 102 pp M. 3.60

Dahme, Lena F.—Women in the Life and Art of Conrad Ferdinand Meyer. [Columbia Univ. Germanic Studies, N. S. No. 4]. *New York*: Columbia Univ. Press viii, 420 pp. \$5.00

Dang, J. S.—Darmstädter Wörterbuch. Mit vielen lustigen Zeichnungen von H. Pfeil. *Darmstadt*: Witich, 1936. 280 pp M. 2.75

Diehl, Otto.—Stefan George und das Deutschtum. Diss. *Giessen*: v Munchow, 1936. 84 pp.

Drach, Erich.—Grundgedanken der deutschen Satzlehre. *Frankfurt a. M.*: Diesterweg, 1937. 99 pp. M. 2.80.

Emmel, Hildegard.—Das Verhältnis von ere und triuwe im Nibelungenlied und bei Hartmann und Wolfram Diss. [Frankfurter Quellen u. Forschungen zur germanischen u. romanischen Philologie H 44] *Frankfurt a. M.*: Diesterweg, 1936. 66 pp. M. 2.

Fischer, Jechiel.—Das Jiddische und sein Verhältnis zu den deutschen Mundarten unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der ostgalizischen Mundart T 1 Allgemeiner Teil Lautlehre (einschliesslich Phonetik der ostgalizischen Mundart) 1 Hälfte Allgemeiner Teil. Diss. Heidelberg. *Leipzig* O Schmidt, 1936 173 pp

Fleischer, R. A.—Die Buchhandlerfamilie Fleischer in der Zeit Goethes Mit einem Vorwort von Ernst Beutler *Leipzig*: Carl Fr. Fleischer, 1937 143 pp M 3.50

Gassen, Kurt.—Albert Schwarz (1859-1921). [S-A aus Pommersche Lebensbilder Bd. 2.] *Greifswald. Univ.-Bibl* 1936 Pp 424-434.

Glunz, H. H.—Die Literaturästhetik des europäischen Mittelalters Wolfram, Rosenroman, Chaucer, Dante [Das Abendland. Bd 2]. *Bochum-Langendreer*: H Poppinghaus, 1937. xvi, 608 pp 4°. M. 20.

Goethes Ehe in Briefen [Briefwechsel zwischen Goethe und Christiane]. Hrsg. von Hans Gerhard Graf Neue vollständige Ausg. mit Einleitung Goethes Ehe Von W. v. Wasiliewski Mit 12 Bildtafeln *Potsdam*: Rutten & Loening, 1937 lxxiii, 787 pp M. 8 50

Hauser, Oswald.—Gustav Frenssen als niederdeutscher Dichter. Untersuchungen zu Landschaft und Volkstum seiner Heimat Diss. Kiel. [Form und Geist, Bd. 40] *Leipzig*: Eichblatt, 1936. viii, 109 pp. M. 5.

Hebbel, Friedrich.—Tagebücher. In drei Bänden Hrsg. von Gerhard Fricke Bd 1-3 *Leipzig*: Reclam [1936]. 403; 458; 414 pp. Each M. 2.45.

Hesse, Richard.—Tierv Verbreitung und Sprachverbreitung [S-A aus Sitzungsber d. Preuss. Akad d. Wiss. Phys.-math. Kl. 1936, No. 26]. *Berlin*: de Gruyter, 1936. 14 pp. M. 1.

Hofmann, Irmgard.—Studien zum Goethe-Schillerschen Briefwechsel. Diss. Frankfurt. [Frankfurter Quellen u. Forschungen zur germanischen u. romanischen Philologie. H. 16]. *Frankfurt a. M.*: Diesterweg, 1937 65 pp M. 2 20.

Hohoff, Curt.—Komik und Humor bei Heinrich von Kleist. Ein Beitrag zur Klärung der geistigen Struktur eines Dichters Diss. Münster. [Germanische Studien H 184] *Berlin*: Ebering, 1937. 80 pp. M. 3.20.

Kaubisch, Martin.—Rainer Maria Rilke Mystik und Künstlertum. *Dresden*: Jess [1936]. 70 pp. M. 2.

Koischwitz, Otto.—Reise in die Literatur. In neun überblicken dreizehn Wanderungen und einem Abschied *Chicago*: J B Lippincott Co [1937] x, 195 pp

Kornhardt, Hildegard.—Exemplum Eine bedeutungsgeschichtliche Studie Diss. Göttingen *Borna-Leipzig*: Noske, 1936. viii, 95 pp

Kunz, Gerhard.—Theodor Storms Verhältnis zur Volkspoesie Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Deutung des Sentimentalen bei Storm. Diss. Frankfurt *Frankfurt a. M.*: Schroder, 1936 viii, 161 pp

Lang, Margarete.—Tannhauser [Von deutscher Poeterey Bd 17] *Leipzig*: J. J. Weber, 1936. 232 pp M. 13.

Lasher-Schlitt, Dorothy.—Grillparzer's Attitude toward the Jews Diss. New York Univ *New York*: published by the author, 1936 xii, 128 pp

Ludwig, Otto.—Otto Ludwig-Kalender. Jahrbuch des Otto Ludwig-Vereins Hrsg. im Auftr. des Arbeitsausschusses von Wilh Greiner. Jg 9 1937 *Weimar*: Bohlau [1936]. 117 pp. 8 plates

Matthias, Gustav.—Sprachlich-sachliche Flurnamendeutung auf volkskundlicher Grundlage. Beispielheft dargestellt an den Orts- und Flurnamen des Kreises Uelzen [Museums- und Heimatblätter für den Kreis Uelzen, Hft 2] *Hildesheim* Lax, 1936 xii, 190 pp M. 6.

Mullenhoff, Karl.—Briefwechsel zwischen — und Wilhelm Scherer Im Auftrag d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. hrsg. von Albert Lertzmann Mit einer Einführung von Edward Schroder [Das Literatur-Archiv. Bd. 5] *Berlin*: de Gruyter, 1937. xxii, 652 pp M. 14.

Oefftering, Wilh. E.—Geschichte der Literatur in Baden T 2. Von Hebel bis Scheffel. [Heimatblätter "Vom Bodensee zum Main" Nr. 44]. *Karlsruhe*: C F. Müller, 1937 192 pp 4°. M 3 90.

Platen. Gedachtnisschrift der Univ.-Bibliothek Erlangen zum 100 Jahrestag des Todes August von Platens Veröffentlicht mit Unterstützung der Platen-Ges. Hrsg. von E. Stollreither. *Erlangen*: Univ.-Bibl, 1936 188 pp. M. 6.

Plümacher, Walther.—Versuch einer metaphysischen Grundlegung literaturwissenschaftlicher Grundbegriffe aus Kants Antinomienlehre mit Anwendung auf das Kunstwerk Hermann Hesses Diss. Bonn. [Bonner deutsche Studien. H. 1]. *Würzburg*: Triltsch, 1936. v, 80 pp M. 2.

Raith, Walther.—Carl Spitteler und die neue Gemeinschaft. Diss. Giessen. *Limburg*: Limburger Vereinsdruckerei, 1936. 173 pp.

Rieger, Alfred.—Die Mundart der Bezirke Römerstadt und Sternberg. Lautlehre. [Bei-

trage zur Kenntnis sudetendeutscher Mundarten 8] *Reichenberg*: Kraus, 1935. 86 pp M 2 50

Roedl, Urban. — Adalbert Stifter Geschichte seines Lebens. *Berlin*: Rowohlt [1936] 468 pp M 5 50.

Sals, J. R. von. — Rainer Maria Rilke's schweizer Jahre Geschrieben zum 10 Jahrestag seines Todes am 29 Dez 1936 [Die Schweiz im deutschen Geistesleben III Reihe, Bd. 23]. *Leipzig*: Huber [1936] M 5 10

Scheffel, Joseph Viktor von — Eine Studienfreundschaft Scheffels Briefe an Friedrich Eggers 1844-1849. Im Auftrag des Deutschen Scheffel-Bundes eingeleitet u hrsg. von Gerda Ruge [Gabe des Deutschen Scheffelbundes an seine Mitglieder 12] *Karlsruhe*: 1936. xv, 88 pp 4 plates

Scheibenberger, Karl — Der Einfluss der Bibel und des Kirchenliedes auf die Lyrik der deutschen Befreiungskriege Diss *Frankfurt. Gelnhausen*. Kalbfleisch, 1936 70 pp

Scherer, Christoph. — Zum Briefwechsel zwischen Goethe und Johannes Müller Eine wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Untersuchung *Bamberg*: Buchner, 1936 70 pp. M 3

Schneider, Friedrich. — Der deutsche Weg zu Dante *Weimar*: Bohlau, 1936 26 pp. 4 plates M 1 35.

Schütz, Wilh. von. — Biographische Notizen über Heinrich von Kleist In Faks. Nachbildung mit einem Geleitwort hrsg. von Georg Minde-Pouet Sondergabe zur Kleist-Festwoche in Bochum, Nov 1936. [Schriften der Kleist-Gesellschaft. Bd 16] *Berlin*: Weidmann, 1936 4 leaves, 19 pp. 4°. M. 4.

Schwarz, Otfried. — Das Recht in den sozialen Dramen, erläutert am Arbeitsvertrag Diss. *Erlangen*: Hofer & Limmert, 1936 62 pp

Taylor, Archer and Ellis, Frances Hanke-meier. — A Bibliography of Meistergesang. [Indiana University Studies, XXIII]. *Bloomington, Ind.*: Univ Bookstore, 1936 92 pp. \$0 75.

Thiergartner, Hans. — Der Romanschriftsteller Richard Voss und sein Italienerlebnis Diss. *Frankfurt Ochsenfurt a M*: Fritz & Rappert, 1936 67 pp.

Volkman, Ludwig. — Der tolle Hagen. Ein Satyrspiel in Goethes Leben. *Leipzig*: Insel, 1936. 42 pp. M. 5.

Vollmer, Hans. — Neue Texte zur Bibelverdeutschung des Mittelalters. Hrsg. in Gemeinschaft mit Arthur Thomas Hatto, Fritz Julicher, Willy Ludtke und Ludwig Vollmer. [Bibel und deutsche Kultur Veröffentlichungen des Deutschen Bibel-Archivs in Hamburg, Bd VI]. *Potsdam*: Akad. Verlagsges. Athenaion, 1936. viii, 274 pp.

Walzel, Oskar. — Poesie und Nichtpoesie.

Frankfurt a. M.: Schulte-Bulmke, 1937. 235 pp M. 9 50

Weber, Claus — Heinrich Lersch Dichter und Arbeiter *Freiburg i B.*: E. Schmied, 1936 90 Pf

Werner, Alfred. — Richard Beer-Hofmann. Sinn und Gestalt. [Zum 70 Geburtstag] *Wien VIII*: Heinrich Glanz, 1936. 47 pp M 1 75.

Werner, Burkhardt. — Die alten Namen der Gemarkung Butzbach Diss [S.-A. aus Flurnamenbuch des Volksstaats Hessen, H. 10] *Gießen*: v. Munchow, 1936. 81 pp.

Wittmann, Fritz — Der Arzt im Spiegelbild der deutschen schöngestigen Literatur seit dem Beginn des Naturalismus [Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Medizin u d. Naturwissenschaften H 18]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1936 133 pp M 5 40

Zwerner, Eberhard und Kurt. — Textliste neuhochdeutscher Vorlesesprache schlesischer Farbung [Phonometrische Forschungen. Untersuchungen und Texte zur Sprachvergleichung durch Mass und Zahl Reihe B, Bd 1]. *Berlin*: Metten & Co., 1936. viii, 100 pp M 8.

FRENCH

Bo, C. — J Rivière *Brescia*: Morcelliana, 1936

Bond, O. F. — Les Pauvres Gens, contes par Maupassant, Daudet, Bazin, Bordeaux. *Boston*: Heath, 1937. vi + 55 pp.

Boutchik, V. — Biblog des œuvres litt. russes trad. en fr II. *Paris*: Flory, 1936 19 pp.

Brunello, B. — Rousseau *Modena*: Guanda, 1935

Casati, F. — Baudelaire *Brescia*. Morcelliana, 1936.

Dumesnil, R. — Le réalisme *Paris*. Gigord, 1937. 650 pp. Fr. 60

Flaubert. — Salammbô, éd L. Vincent. II. *Paris*: Hatier, 1936. 96 pp. Fr 3

Gilsoul, R. — La théorie de l'art pour l'art chez les écrivains belges de 1830 à nos jours. *Brussels*: Palais des Acads, 1936 xxiv + 418 pp.

Godefroy — Dict de l'anc. langue fr. T. I. *Paris*: Libr. Prima, 1937 799 pp. Fr 160.

Heidel, H. — Die Terminologie der Finanzverwaltung Frankreichs im 15 Jh. *Leipzig*: Noska, 1936. xi + 141 pp.

Joseph-Renaud. — Les Deux Idoles, ed Zeek and Tinkle. *Boston*: Heath, 1937. viii + 241 pp

La Mothe Le Vayer, T. Corneille etc. — Commentaires sur les Remarques de Vaugelas, éd Jeanne Streicher. II. *Paris*: Droz, 1936. 600 pp. Fr. 60. (Soc. des t fr. mod.)

Levin, L. M.—The Political Doctrine of Montesquieu's "Esprit des lois". its classical background. *New York*: Inst. of Fr. Studies, 1936 xiii + 359 pp.

Millet, A. — L'articulation des voyelles *Paris*. Vrin, 1937. 15 pp

Regula, M.—Précis de grammaire fr. sur une base hist et psych. *Reichenberg*: Stiepel, 1936 viii + 204 + vi pp.

Roche, A. V.—Les idées traditionalistes en Fr de Rivarol à Ch Maurras. *Urbana*: U of Illinois Press, 1937. 235 pp (Ill Studies, XXI, 1-2)

Van Der Lugt, J.—L'Action relig de F. Brunetiere (1895-1906) *Paris*: Desclée, De Brouwer, 1936 248 pp. Fr 20.

ITALIAN

Addeo, P.—Elogio dei proverbi. *Napoli*: Arti graf "La Nuovissima," 1936. 17 pp. L 2

Alfieri, Vittorio.—Saul, ed Gaetano Sborrelli. *Napoli*: Rondinella, 1936. 103 pp. L 2 50.

— Vita, ed. F Carlesi. *Sancasciano Pesa*: Tip. f.lli Stianti, 1936 xvi + 392 pp. L 5.

Alighieri, Dante. — La Divina Commedia, ed. I. Del Lungo I: Inferno. *Firenze*: Le Monnier, 1936 xxiv + 353 pp. L 6.

Arango-Ruiz, V.—Arte e filosofia. [Scritti su Dante, Leopardi, Manzoni, ecc.] *Genova*: E Degli Orfini, 1935. 245 pp L 15.

Balasy et Funaro —L'italien d'aujourd'hui par les textes. *Paris*: Hatier, 1937. 454 pp. Fr. 20.

Battisti, C.—I nomi locali dell'Alta Venosta I. *Firenze*: Rinascimento del libro, 1936. 459 pp L 75

Bonattelli, P.—V Brocchi e A. Fogazzaro È possibile un confronto? *Fidenza*: "La commerciale," 1936. 111 pp. L 3

Bondioli, P.—Manzoni e gli "Amici della verità." Dalle carte inedite di Luigi Tosi. *Milano*: Istituto di propaganda libraria, 1936. 271 pp. L 12.

Bosticca, G. B.—La Beatrice di Vita nuova e del Poema sacro svelata. *Pescia*: Franchi, 1936. 64 pp. L 5

Bottighioni, G.—Atlante linguistico-etnografico italiano della Corsica IV *Pisa*: "L'Italia dialettale," 1935. 800 pp.

Cattaneo, A.—Sunti di letteratura italiana. 2 v. *Milano*: "Cetim," Casa ed. testi istruz. media, 1936. 84 + 96 pp. L 8.

Chini, M.—L'Ariosto innamorato. Studio sopra le rime e sopra l'Orlando Furioso. *Torino*: S. Lattes, 1936 viii + 392 pp. L 14.

Cione, E.—La concezione filosofica del Croce e i suoi "Ultimi saggi." *Napoli*: Edit. Sabina, 1935. 14 pp.

—Introduzione a "Purismo e romanticismo" di S. Baldacchini. *Bari*: Laterza, 1936 xxxv pp.

Croce, B.—La poesia *Bari*: Laterza, 1936. 352 pp L 25.

Cuomo, M. — Gh uomini nei proverbi *Salerno*: tip f.lli Di Giacomo, 1936. 191 pp L 7

D'Annunzio, Gabriele.—Cento e cento e cento e cento pagine del libro segreto di — tentato di morire, ed A Cocles *Milano* Ist. naz per la ediz. di tutte le opere di G. D'Annunzio, 1935 lxxviii + 314 pp.

De Donno, A.—Paolo Orano. Saggio critico *Roma*: Editr. Pinciana, 1935 167 pp.

Della Sala, V.—Ottocentisti meridionali *Napoli*: Guida, 1935 330 pp. L 18

De Michelis, E.—Saggio su Tozzi *Firenze*: "La Nuova Italia," 1936 269 pp. L 15.

De Sanctis, Francesco. — Gh scrittori d'Italia Antologia critica a cura di N. Cortese. III. Dal Settecento all'Ottocento *Napoli*: A Morano, 1935 323 pp L 10.

Di Nola, M.—Commento al XXIX canto del Paradiso *Foligno*: Tip. Salvati, 1936. 18 pp.

Federzoni, G.—Raccoglimenti e ricordi. Edizione definitiva *Bologna*: Zanichelli, 1935. 303 pp. L 20.

— Studi e diporti danteschi. Edizione definitiva [Prefazione di L. Federzoni]. *Ibid*, 1935. vi + 381 pp. L 20

Finetti, G. F.—Difesa dell'autorità della Sacra Scrittura contro Giambattista Vico. Dissertazione del 1768 con introd. di B Croce. Unitovi il sesto supplemento alla Bibliog Vichiana *Bari*: Laterza, 1936. xvi + 120 pp.

Franchi, R.—Bighetto per cinque. [Saggi critici su Gianna Manzini, Giuseppe Ungaretti, Aldo Palazzeschi, Camillo Sbarbaro, Arturo Loria]. *Ancona*: All'insegna del Conero, 1935. 107 pp. L 5.

Gabellini, M. — Giosue Carducci vate d'Italia Giosue Carducci e Madesimo Nel 1° centenario della nascita. *Como*: Ed. de "L'idea sociale," 1936. 69 pp. L 5.

Gelosi, G.—Paul Heyeses Leopardi-Ubertragungen. *Torino*: "Opes," Off poligr edit Subalpina, 1936 133 pp. L 15.

Goldoni, Carlo.—La famiglia dell'anti-quario, ed. G Guarini *Lanciano*: Carabba, 1936. 124 pp L 5

— Le smanie per la villeggiatura, ed. G. Guarini. *Ibid*, 1936. 112 pp. L 4.

— La vedova scaltra, ed A Marenduzzo. *Milano*: Signorelli, 1935 94 pp. L 3.

Gustarelli, A.—Alfredo Oriani. A cura di —. I tempi e la vita. L'opera: caratteri fondamentali ed importanza. "La rivolta

ideale" La rivendicazione *Milano*: Valardi, 1936. 75 pp. L. 3.

Janni, E.—In piccioletta barca Libro della prima conoscenza di Dante *Milano*: Agnelli, 1936 219 pp. L. 8.

Leopardi, Giacomo—Tria carmina latine heroico versu reddidit O Mogàvero *Torino*: Tip E. Arduini, 1936. 15 pp.

—Tutte le poesie di —, ed G. Mazzoni. 3 v. *Firenze*: G. Barbèra, 1936 xvi + 320, 390, 396 pp L. 18.

Lo Vecchio, M. M —L'opera di Gabriele D'Annunzio *Torino*. Paravia, 1936 vii + 467 pp L. 15.

Luigi, F. and others—Carducci nel centenario della nascita *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1935 xvi + 219 pp. L. 12

Mainardi Arlotto (Piovano Arlotto).—Scelta di facenze e burle del Piovano Arlotto *Firenze*: Giannini, 1936 106 pp. L. 10.

Masnovo, O.—La vera casa del Petrarca in Parma *Parma*: Off graf. Fresching [1936] 54 pp

Mastroianni, F.—L'infinito Leopardiano. *Nicastro*: Tip V. Gighotti, 1935. 19 pp. L. 2 50

Meozzi, A.—G D'Annunzio Il tribuno, l'uomo d'arme, il poeta (La vita e l'opera di G D'Annunzio, Vol II). *Pisa*: Vallerini, 1935 375 pp L. 12

Metastasio, Pietro.—Attilio Regolo, ed G. Guarini. *Lanciano*: Carabba, 1936 83 pp. L. 3.

Neri, F.—Storia e poesia La rinascita medievale, fiabe, dugentismo, [ecc] *Torino*: G Gambino, 1936 191 pp. L. 15.

Orano, Paolo. — Poeti. Orazio intimo. L'amante timido (Petrarca). Carducci marenmano. Una lampada nel buio (Pascoli). *Roma*: Edit. Pinciana, 1935. 209 pp.

Riccobono, G.—Vocabolario italiano-inglese. *Palermo*: Trimarchi, 1935. xi + 468 pp. L. 30.

Rizzi, F. — Per la casa parmense del Petrarca. Lettera aperta al prof O. Masnovo. *Parma*: tip La Bodoniana, 1936 18 pp. L. 2.

Tabani, G.—"Le lucciole del sentiero" di Alfredo Baccelli. Saggio critico. *Villa Passo di Teramo*: "Quaderni de l'Arciere," 1935. 15 pp.

Tasso, Torquato.—La Gerusalemme liberata, ed. P. Nardi. 4^a ed. riveduta e accresciuta *Milano-Verona*: Mondadori, 1935. 558 pp.

Troni, A.—I colloqui col tempo. *Palermo*: "I quaderni de la Sinossi," 1935. 103 pp. L. 5.

Valgimigli, M.—Il nostro Carducci. Maestri

e scolari della scuola bolognese. *Bologna*: Zanichelli, 1935. 121 pp. L. 10.

Venturini, L. — L'anima del dialetto Alcuni capitoli della storia del vivere milanese interpretata dalle vecchie espressioni dialettali *Milano*. "Familia Meneghina," 1935 240 pp L. 10.

Villani, C.—Lo scrittore della tormenta: Angelo Gatti. *Torino*: Gambino, 1936. 196 pp. L. 10.

Vinay, G.—L'umanesimo subalpino nel secolo XV Studi e ricerche *Torino*: 1935 321 pp L. 25

SPANISH

Alcázar Anguita, E. — Bernardo López García *Guadalajara*: Suc de A. Concha, 1935 69 pp

Arios Sanjurjo, J.—Avellaneda y el sentido oculto del "Quijote" Parte crítica *Santiago*: Paredes, 1935 32 pp 3 ptas

Bardon, M.—Cervantès *Paris*: Renaissance du Livre, 1935 196 pp

Barja, C.—Literatura esp Libros y autores contemporáneos *Madrid*: V Suárez, 1935. vii + 494 pp 12 ptas

Barrera, I. J.—Estudios de lit castellana El Siglo de Oro *Quito*: Editorial Ecuatoriana, 1935. 404 pp

Bermúdez de Castro y O'Lawlor, S.—El Romanticismo *Madrid*: Huelves, 1935. 74 pp

Bolis, Wanda.—Francisco de Quevedo y Villegas e i suoi "Sueños" *Napoli*: Edit Meridionali, 1935 23 pp L. 3

Carayon, M — Lope de Vega. *Paris*: Rieder, 1935 Fr. 20

Carrasco, R—Lope de Vega y Mira de Amescua *Guadix*: 1935

Casamitjana, F. P —Ramón de la Cruz und der französische Kultureinfluss im Spanien des XVIII Jh *Bonn*: Rohrscheid, 1935 viii + 159 pp. M. 4 80.

Delano, Lucile K. — A Critical Index of Sonnets in the Plays of Lope de Vega *Toronto*: U. of Toronto Press, 1935 70 pp

Diéz-Canedo, E—Unidad y diversidad de las letras hispánicas *Madrid*: Archivos, 1935 57 pp

Domenchina, J. J.—Crónicas de "Gerardo Rivera" *Madrid*: Aguilar, 1935. 253 pp. 5 ptas

Engel, G.—Don Juan Valera (1824-1905) *Berlin*: Doring, 1935 65 pp M. 2 40

Espinosa Rodríguez, C — La evolución fonética de la Lengua castellana en Cuba *Habana*: Echevarría, 1935 24 pp

—La novela picaresca y el "Guzmán de Alfarache" *Habana*: Echevarría, 1935. 28 pp.

Gascó Contell, E.—Panorama de la lit esp. *Madrid*: Nuestra Raza, 1935. 176 pp 3 ptas.

Gascón, M.—Una carta inédita de Menéndez y Pelayo al jesuita Padre Louis Martín Santander. Soc. Menéndez y Pelayo, 1935. 10 pp.

Grismer, R L. and Arjona, Doris K.—Second Sp Grammar and Comp *New York*: Harper, 1937 xi + 297 pp

Gutiérrez Ballesteros, J M.—Sal y sol de Andalucía. Refranes glosados, cantares. . . Prólogo de F Rodríguez Marín *Madrid*: Pueyo, 1935 143 pp

Junta del Centenario de Lope de Vega.—Catálogo de la Exposición bibliográfica de Lope de Vega organizada por la Biblioteca Nacional *Madrid*: [Gráfica Universal], 1935 viii + 246 pp

Kleinhappl, J. — Der Staat bei Ludwig Molina *Innsbruck*: F Rauch, 1935 179 pp.

León-Felipe —Antología (versos). *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1935 138 pp 5 ptas

Madariaga, S. de.—Don Quixote An Introductory Essay in Psychology *Oxford* [and N Y]: Oxford University Press, 1935 159 pp

Martínez y Martínez, F.—Don Guillén de Castro no pudo ser Alonso Fernández de Avellaneda. *Valencia*: [Hijo de Vivas Mora], 1935 120 pp.

Mazzei, Pilade.—La poesia di Espronceda *Florence*: La Nuova Italia, 1935 235 pp. L 12.

Neddermann, Emmy.—Die symbolistischen Stilelemente im Werke von Juan Ramón Jiménez. *Hamburg*: Rom Sem., 1935 xi + 146 pp

Nineteenth Century Spanish Plays.—Ed. E. Brett. *London*: Appleton-Century [1935]. ix + 889 pp

Outzen, Gerda.—El dinamismo en la obra de Pereda. Trad. del alemán de María Fernanda de Pereda *Santander*: 1935 246 pp.

Palafox y Mendoza, Juan de.—Diario del Viaje a Alemania. Obra inédita del V. D. . . Ed. Kristina de Arteaga. *Madrid*: Blass, 1935. 112 pp.

Panarese, L.—Lope de Vega e Giambattista Marino. *Maglie*: Donadeo, 1935. 21 pp.

Rojo Orcajo, T.—Las fuentes históricas del "Isidro" de Lope de Vega El pajarillo en la enramada o algo inédito y desconocido de Lope de Vega Carpio. *Madrid*: Roque Pidal, 1935. 47 pp + 1 facsimil. 10 ptas.

Rubifios, J.—Lope de Vega, como poeta religioso. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1935 110 pp 3 50 ptas.

Sánchez Estevan, I.—Mariano José de Larra "Figaro." *Madrid*: Hernando, 1935. 277 pp. 5 ptas.

San Román, F. de B.—Lope de Vega, los cómicos toledanos y el poeta sastre Serie de documentos inéditos de los años de 1590 a 1615 *Madrid*: Góngora, 1935. cviii + 236 pp + viii láms 8 ptas.

PORTUGUESE

Almeida Garrett, J. B. de.—Frei Luis de Sousa. Edição segundo a primeira edição revista pelo autor *London*: Sidgwick and Jackson, [1935] iv + 88 pp (New Term Portuguese Texts)

Bibliografia Filológica Portuguesa. — (Diccionários, Gramáticas, Ortografias, etc.). *Lisboa*: Centro de Estudos Filológicos, 1935. (Junta de Educação Nacional.) [Prólogo por R. de Sá Nogueira]

Castro e Almeida, V. de —Vie de Camoens. *Paris*: Eds. Duchartre, 1935. x + 192 pp Fr. 25.

Figueiredo, F. de —Pyrene. Ponto de vista para uma introdução à história comparada das literaturas portuguesa e espanhola *Lisboa*: Ed. Empresa Nacional de Publicidade, 1935 194 pp con grabados.

Forjas Tingueros, L.—O nacionalismo de Eça de Queiroz *Lisboa*. 1935. 13 pp

Gonçalves Rodrigues, A.—Mariana Alcoforado História e crítica de uma fraude literária *Coimbra* Faculdade de Letras, 1935 68 pp.

Moreno, A. — Dicionário elementar da língua portuguesa *Porto*: "Educação Nacional," 1934. 909 pp.

Nemesio, V.—Herculano. Ensaio de interpretação da sua personalidade na história do século XIX. 2 v. *Lisboa*: Bertrand, 1934. xxxii + 409 + 313 pp

Santos, J. E. dos.—Santo António na literatura e na arte portuguesas *Lisboa*: 1935. 30 pp

GENERAL

Adler, M. J.—Art and Prudence, a study in practical philosophy. *New York*: Longmans, Green, 1937. xiv + 686 pp \$5 00.

Boas, George.—A Primer for critics. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1937 x + 153 pp. \$2.00

Du Cange.—Glossarium med. et inf. lat. Ed. nova de L. Favre T. I. *Paris*: Libr. Prima, 1937. 832 pp Fr. 120

Leander, Folke.—Humanism and Naturalism, a comp. study of Seillière, Babbitt and P E More *Goteborg*: Wettergren & Kerber, 1937 227 pp.

Quental, A. de.—Cartas inéditas de — a Wilhelm Störck. Ed. H Meier. *Coimbra*: Inst. Alemão da Universidade, 1935. 23 pp.

Staubach, C. N.—How to study languages. *Boston*: Heath, 1937. vi + 24 pp.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LII

MAY, 1937

Number 5

A FRAGMENT OF A DRAMA BY HERMAN GRIMM

From the estate of Charles Harvey Genung (died 1921) the Trinity College Library has acquired a parchment-bound notebook containing various items written in the hand of Herman Grimm (1828-1901), the son of Wilhelm Grimm and formerly Professor of the History of Art at Berlin. The book was purchased by Grimm and used by him for notes written during his visit to Italy during the second half of the year 1857. On the cover is the signature "Herman Grimm," together with the date "Siena. 17. Juni 1857." The following lines, written on the inside of the cover, will explain how Genung obtained possession of the book: "Dies Buch hat Herman Grimm gekauft in Siena 1857, wo er in der Gesellschaft des Prof. Hubner langere Zeit weilte. Mir geschenkt mit beiliegenden Papieren am 26 Mai 1889. (signed) Chas. H. Genung."

There can be no doubt about the fact that Genung and Grimm were closely connected by ties of friendship and admiration. This increases the probability that the manuscript under discussion is authentic. Genung studied under Grimm at Berlin and served for a time as Grimm's private secretary (see the memorial words on C. H. Genung which appeared in *The Nation*, Vol. 112, No. 2917; June 1, 1921), and thus had access to Grimm's papers. The friendship between Genung and Grimm can likewise be shown by the inscriptions written on the fly-leaves of several books now owned by the Trinity College Library, but which were formerly the property of Genung. For example, a copy of Grimm's lectures on Goethe, held at the University in Berlin (4te Auflage. Berlin, Wilhelm Hertz, 1887) has the signature "Charles H. Genung" on the fly-leaf, followed by the date "11. Feb. 1888" and the words "Berlin. Geschenk des Verfassers." A more interesting inscription is found in a copy of Grimm's *Das Leben Michelangelo's*

(*Erster Band, Fünfte Auflage. Berlin, Wm. Hertz, 1879*). This book was a gift from Grimm to Genung, and Grimm wrote on the back of the cover. "America und Deutschland sind geistig aufeinander angewiesen. Es ist ein beruhigender Gedanke für mich, einen Fortschritt in dieser Richtung zu erkennen. Ein grosser Mann, er mag noch soviel gethan haben, wird beim Abschlusse seines Lebens doch nur eine Masse von Fragmenten zu hinterlassen scheinen. Das Amt des Geschichtsschreibers ist, diese Bruchstücke als Theile einer idealen Totalität zu erkennen und glaubwürdig darzustellen. Berlin, im März 1887. (signed) Herman Grimm. Herrn Charles H. Genung zur Erinnerung an seine Berliner Studienzeit." Such statements attest the friendship that existed between Genung and Grimm, and give a considerable amount of verisimilitude to the claim that the parchment-bound notebook contains material written by Grimm which has not been published heretofore.

Until the year 1857 Grimm had been interested to a large extent in the writing of plays, although in his later life he acquired a more enduring reputation through his essays on art and his biographies of Raphael and Michelangelo. The following unpolished fragment of the second act of a drama to be known as *Rotrudis* may well mark the point at which Grimm decided to devote himself chiefly to the history of art. The museums of Rome apparently caused the author to lose interest in the drama which he had begun, for the lines entitled *Rotrudis* come to an end quite abruptly and are followed immediately in Grimm's notebook by long descriptions of his daily visits to the paintings in the Vatican and other collections in Rome. As a consequence, work on *Rotrudis* stopped altogether, and the imperfect fragment remained unfinished, although the various corrections added in pencil above the lines of the original version show that Grimm was not satisfied with the few verses which he had already written. The corrections and additions in pencil are included in the following transcription at the bottom of each page. Lines are not numbered in Grimm's notebook, and the names of the characters speaking are not indicated by the author.

Florenz am Tage S. Giovanni 1857.

ROTRUDIS

Zweiter Aufzug. Zweite Hälfte

[Chlotar]

- Als ich hierherritt — auf dem Wege — als ich
Mit meinen Hoffnungen mit meinen Traumen
So gute Bruderschaft noch hielt —: wir glaubten
Einander auf das Wort —: und wer mir heute
- [5] Von jener Laune ahnungsvoller Kuhnheit
Nur einen Tropfen gabe! und ich schwamm
In einem Meer davon! — ich war ein Kind
Ein Narr, dass ich hierherkam — Wie ich mich
In's Meer warf — welch ein Abend! — wie verlockend
- [10] Die Lichter des Palastes — oben kam ich
An in der Stadt — · dort in den hellen Fenstern
Wohnt sie, so hort ich — ein Gewitter stand
Am Himmel, dicht und dunkel — ich hinaus!
Und zu den Fenstern Dammernd lagen sie
- [15] Vor mir hoch oben —, melancholisch schlugen
Die Wogen an die Mauern da, ich sah
Einen Schatten, hier und da das Licht verdunkelnd
Ich dachte, ob sie's wäre — dass sie oben
Vereinsamt auf und niederginge, dass sie
- [20] An mich gedacht — sehnsüchtig — ja beim Himmel

Lines 11 to 20 The author has made a vertical stroke in pencil through these lines to indicate that he did not consider them satisfactory.

The following verses were written on a separate sheet of paper which was folded and kept in the notebook.

und ging im ersten Rausche
Des Glücks zu weilen wo Rotrudis weilte
Durch all die [illegible] wie verlockend
Die Lichter des Palastes und im Meere
Der Widerschein, ich fragte wer da wohnte
Rotrudis' Namen hört' ich, mich durchflog
Ein Sturm von Sehnsucht. Dort die hellen Fenster
Da wohnt sie. Ein Gewitter stand am Himmel
Kein Schiffer wollte mehr hinaus, ich warf mich
Hinein ins dunkle Element und näher
Kam ich dem Lichte, höher wuchsen vor mir
Die dunkeln Thurme und die Wellen schlugen
An das Gemäuer Da sah ich empor
Es war ganz still, ein Schatten schnitt zuweilen
Das Licht ab — war sie's die da oben einsam
Im Saale hin und herging — dachte sie
An ihre Heimath, dachte sie an mich?
So träumte meine Sehnsucht — aber heute.

- Es war mein Glaube damals. — Aber heute
 Ist ers nicht mehr — sie liebt Valerian!
 Und dass *ich* komme sie von ihm zu fordern
 Macht doppelt mich verhasst — sie liebt den Prinzen
- [25] Und ich kam, sie zu trennen — und ich dachte
 Sie konnte *mir* gehören! Sie zu sehn
 Mit ihr zu reden — fruchtlos — sie vermeidets
 Als wär ich Gift — sie weiss auch nichts
 Und dennoch ists als ahnte sies und zwange mich
- [30] Ihr zu verschweigen was mich nach Byzanz fuhr.
 Sie muss es horen, neben ihr muss ich
 Denselben Weg zuruck — ich war im Stande
 Im goldenen Netze das die Kaisrin ausspannt
 Mit offenen Augen mich zu fangen — nur
- [35] Damit ein Ende wäre — —
- [Irene] Wieder stehst du so
 In traurigen Gedanken
- [Chlotar] Hohe Herrin
 Den traurigen Gedanken musst ich danken
 Weil sie dich locken, dein scharfsichtig Auge
 Auf mich zu lenken.
- [Irene] Oft wenn du versunken
- [40] In dich allein, von Allem abgezogen
 Starr vor dich hinsiehst, wie ichs oft bemerke
 Was denkst du dann?
- [Chlotar] Warum die Frage Kaisrin?
 Ich ~~möchte wissen ob in meinen Händen —~~
 Die Macht sei diesen Trübsinn zu bestreiten
- [45] Du schweigst? Lässt dich das Leben in Byzanz
 Die Heimath schmerzlich missen? Hat dein Blick
 etc. [!]
- [Irene] Und was die Welt sagt wollen wir erwarten
 Selbst, was sie thut — jetzt lass ich dich allein —
- [Irene ab]
- [Chlotar] Soweit gefuhrt? o Zaubrin! Und ich hier
- [50] Mit einem Purpurmantel um die Gliedern [!]
 Mit goldnen Schuhn mit Sklaven die den Boden
 Bei meinem Anblick küssen und ich selber
 Der Oberste von allen diesen Schurken
 Der erste Ihrer Sklaven — o ich würde
- [55] Sie fuhlen lassen dass ein Franke nicht
 So seine Freiheit hingiebt — still, das denk' ich?

28. sie weiss nicht was ich bringe, sie weiss nicht was ich will; kein
 Mensch weiss was mich herfuhr 29. Ist es als wusste sie's

46: Chlotars speech is not completed.

- Mit ihr? die ihrem Sohn das Reich gestohlen
 Mit ihr die seinen Vater ihm zuvor
 Vergiftete — . Und Rotrudis der ich
 [60] Freund bin auf ewig dann — [*Rotrudis erscheint*] dort!
 — ist sies wirklich
 Langsam — so schritt sie ehmal's nicht, sie schreitet
 Als zogen die Gewänder sie zu Boden
 O Liebste hat der Athem von Byzanz
 Die Wangen so dir angehaucht — Rotrudis!
 [65] Hörst du mich nicht? siehst du mich nicht? bin ich
 Nicht hier für dich?
 [*Rotrudis*] Für mich?
 [*Chlotar*] Für dich Rotrudis
 Weist du denn dass ich hier bin — oder nicht?
 Weist du warum ich kam? Du fragst mich nicht.
 Du willst's nicht kennen. — wieder dieses Lächeln
 [70] Das mir so fremd ist — o Rotrudis lass mich
 Jetzt nicht dir nachsehn sprachlos — red' ich jetzt nicht
 So red ich niemals.
 [*Rotrudis*] Wenn du reden wolltest
 Hab ich dich jemals nicht gehört?
 [*Chlotar*] o hast du
 Nicht tausendmal rückwärts gedrängt die Worte
 [75] Die mir das Herz zersprengten — und
 Ich rede vom Vergangnen nicht hier wieder — ich habe
 Dir Wicht'ges mitzuthellen und du machst mir's
 Unmöglich.
 [*Rotrudis*] Sein wir offen zu einander
 Chlotar jetzt will ich sprechen. Man erzählt mir
 [80] Irene wolle dich zum Gatten wählen.
 Ich weiss nicht was dich herfuhr nach Byzanz
 Ich kenne deine Plane nicht. Wir waren
 Befreundet als wir Kinder waren — jetzt
 Wenn *das* geschieht, was man mir sagt, bist du
 [85] Mein Feind —
 [*Chlotar*] Rotrudis.
 [*Rotrudis*] Noch zwei Worte lass mich
 Aussprechen. *Wirst du Kaiser* so verschwindet
 Dem Prinzen, dem *ich* mich vermählen werde,
 Die Hoffnung auf den Thron *Du* wirst nicht Kaiser
 Um thatenlos zu ruhn, wir aber lassen
 [90] Uns nicht berauben und Valerian
 Muss dich bekämpfen oder unterliegen.
 Und wo er steht steh ich und wo er fällt
 Fall ich mit ihm.

- [*Chlotar*] Rotrudis — eine Frage
 Eh du dich von mir wendest, eine Frage
 [95] Beim Himmel wenn ich verschweigen konnte
 Ich thät es, doch es sei gewagt
 Ich schweige, doch sie sei gethan, es hangt
 Tod dran und Leben. Gieb mir Antwort
 Als hortest du in tiefer Einsamkeit
 [100] Die Worte aus dir selber und gabe
 Da kein Entrinnen vor der Wahrheit weiter.
 Liebst du Valerian?
- [*Rotrudis*] Was macht dich kühn
 Das mich zu fragen? — — da er mein Gemahl wird!
 Noch tragst *du* unsere Krone nicht! Noch bin *ich*
 [105] Die Tochter deines Kaisers und du sein
 Vasall mit dem ich rede!
- [*Chlotar*] Ja das bin ich
 Und deines Vaters Tochter du, wohlan
 Valerians Gemahlin wirst du nicht!
- [*Rotrudis*] Nicht?!
- [*Chlotar*] Nicht! dein Vater sendet mich hierher
 [110] Was ich nun sage sagt der Kaiser der mich
 Zu dir mit seinem Willen schickt, du kehrst
 Zurück und mir ertheilt er den Befehl
 Dir das Geleit zu geben.
- [*Rotrudis*] Du! mit dir
 Mit dir zurück! Weh mir mit dir zurück
 [115] In all das Elend wieder o ihr Heilgen
 Warum befahl er nicht mich hier zu todten
 Chlotar, zieh doch den Dolch von deiner Seite
 Und stoss ihn mir in's Herz. Warum stehst du
 Da und es lastet deine Gegenwart
 [120] Auf mir als hing an einem Seidenfaden
 Ein Felsen über mir. Warum kamst du —
 Warum? um mich zu quälen — o ist nirgends
 Auf Erden ein Versteck in das ich flüchte.
 (ruhiger, ironisch majestätisch zu sich selbst)
 Doch du bleibst hier, *sie* halt dich fest — sie weiss
 [125] Zu fesseln! — (fast glücklich) und *ich* fort! ich von
 euch beiden
 Getrennt! Glückliche Bothschaft, ich, dich hier
 Im griechischen Purpur *nicht* vor meinen Augen

97: Gieb mir Antwort, denn es hangt. 96-101 These lines crossed out with pencil.

109: der Kaiser sendet 115: In dieses Elend 117: das Schwert von 118: stoss es 120. an einem schwachen Faden

126: ich, Chlotar 131: Irene mir vermählt?— Glaubst du, Rotrudis

- Dank dir! Befreiung, Gluck, o Wonne, wieder
In's Vaterland — und mir im Rucken weit
- [130] [Chlotar] Endlich fur immer dann, was meine Qual war.
Irene mich in Fesseln? — Glaubst du, Fürstin
Verlockend ware *mir* der griechische Purpur?
Mir ist ers nie gewesen — doch du glaubst
Er musse jeden wie dich einst bezaubern
- [135] Hierhergeloctt meinst du ein jeder musste
Wie du von ihm bezaubert sein.
- [Rotrudis] Wie ich?
- [Chlotar] Hast du mit freiem Willen nicht gewählt?
- [Rotrudis] Mit freiem Willen?
- [Chlotar] Ja du standest vor mir
Noch hab ich's vor den Augen, niemals werd ich's
- [140] Vergessen wie du damals vor mir standest
Und auf die Frage die dein Vater stellte
Die Antwort gabst wie dir dein Herz gerathen
- [Rotrudis] Mein Herz?
- [Chlotar] Dein Herz allein, denn frei zu wahlen
Erlaubt er dir und du mit beiden Handen
- [145] Griffst nach dem glanzenden Juwel verhessest
- [Chlotar] Und so mit ausgespannten Flügeln schwebt ich
Dir nach, beglückt — bethort, denn du allmählig
Nahmst einen Stolz an, eine Kalte, die mir
Erst leise dann vernehmlich wiederholten
- [150] Was ich von Grund aus nun erfahren habe.
Du wehrtest mich nicht ab — du hieltest gar nicht
Für möglich — frei wie immer und vertraulich
Verwehrtest du mir nicht um dich zu weilen
Doch wenn ein Wort die Grenze nur berührte
- [155] Da schreckte mich ein Blick ab — wie die Blicke
Als ich dich eben das zu fragen kuhn war
Was dich so zornig machte
- [Chlotar] Und doch zum drittenmal
Fasst ich mich nun, ich wollte reden, fühlte
- [160] Das Wort auf meinen Lippen zittern, — plötzlich
Tratest du zuruck — ich wagt' es dich zu halten
Ganz schüchtern, als du die Hand losreissend

137: Gingst du aus freiem Willen nicht hieher? 138: Aus freiem Willen? Ja aus freier Wahl

145-146: Two pages of manuscript between these lines have been destroyed, possibly by Grimm, since lines 146-157 could easily be a continuation of the preceding speech. 151 Du wiesest 152: Für denkbar 157-158 Another lacuna occurs here. Perhaps lines 158 ff. are an emendation of some speech which has been destroyed

Gingst zu den Andern die am Feuer sassen
Du sprachst, ich sprach, gleichgültig dass etc. [!]

- [Chlotar] [165] In dumpfem Druck — nun hab ich dich gefunden
Für ewige Zeiten — du bist mein.
- [Rotrudis] O lass mich
Fortreden, da ich so unendlich lange
In meiner Seele mit dir sprach, entzuckts mich
Zu sehn wie du mich anhorst — o Chlotar
- [170] Als ich hierherging, glaubst du mich verlockte
Byzanz? Am Abend da du Abschied nahmst
Ach hortest du mein Herz nicht schlagen damals?
Wie oft seitdem sah ich den Mond und dachtest
An jene Nacht, mich nach dem Tode sehndend
- [175] Weil ich mich ja zu dir nicht sehnen durfte.
Nun kamst du und mit dir in einem Athem
Flog das Geruch durch den Palast du würdest
Gemahl der Kaisrin — als ich euch erblickte
Es war ein Donnerschlag für mich — ich sah
- [180] Dich an, dann sie, dich wieder und eiskalt
Und dennoch brennend fühlte was ich vordem einst
Ertragen, was mir unertraglich dünkte,
Schien mir ein verlornes Paradies, die Stunden
In denen ich die Grenze der Betrübnis
- [185] Berührt zu haben glaubte — ach du kamest [Irene
erscheint]
- [Chlotar] Sie darf uns hier nicht finden
- [Rotrudis] Nein sie darf es nicht
- [Chlotar] Wann seh ich dich Geliebte?
- [Rotrudis] Wenn du willst
- [Chlotar] Ich schleiche zu dir heute abend — darf ich
Wir haben uns soviel zu sagen

164-165 Several pages of the notebook at this point are left blank. The same scene between *Chlotar* and *Rotrudis* is continued, however, in line 165 170. du glaubst 174. An jenen Abend 178: Trauen d 183: Schien jetzt.

185-187: On a loose sheet of paper, on the back of which are found still other verses (see note to lines 11-20), Grimm wrote the following:

- [Rot.] O die Kaiserin
Ist schön.
Dort kommt sie.
- [Chl.] Siehst du wie sie schön ist
[Rot.] Lebwohl sie soll uns hier nicht finden.
- [Chl.] Nein
Wann sehen wir uns wieder?
- [Rot.] Wenn du willst

186: (Still Irene) at beginning of line, deleted by author.

- [*Rotrudis*] Ja.
- [190] Komm wenn du willst.
- [*Chlotar*] Lebewohl. — o deine Hande
Sind kalt und zittern
- [*Rotrudis*] Wenn ich dich nicht liebte
Ich zitterte dann nicht
- [*Chlotar*] Lebewohl.
- [*Rotrudis*] Chlotar
Wenn du zur Kaisrin jetzt — sie ist so schon
Ich laugne es nicht wenn — sie dir schön erscheint
- [195] Denk nicht du musstest nun, weil du mich liebst
Sie traurig bewundern — Ist sie besser
Als ich — liebst du sie, gieb mich auf.
- [*Chlotar*] (umarmt sie) *Rotrudis*
- [*Rotrudis*] Als sollt ich sagen "lass uns warten?" Nein
Wir dürfen so nicht reisen. Geh zur Kaisrin
- [200] Und sag ihr was sie wissen soll.
- [*Chlotar*] Sie hat mich
Gerettet aus Gefahr, mich fürstlich dann
Beschenkt und unterhalten ihre Hand
Mir angeboten, und verlangt ich sollte
Mich erst bedenken eh ich Antwort gäbe
- [205] Durft' ich ihr sagen *was* mich von ihr trennte?
[*Rotrudis*] Geh zu ihr. Du bist gut. Ich bin es nicht.
Verzeih mir meine thörichten Gedanken
Von denen du nichts weisst — die mich so quälen
Und an mein Glück nicht glauben weil's zu gross ist
- [210] Chlotar du zurnst mir nicht, wenn ich nicht weiss
Wie man sich anders giebt als man empfindet
Ich darf dich nicht belügen Geh zur Kaisrin
Du liebst mich! (*Chlotar ab.*) O er liebt mich! —
[*Valerian tritt auf*] *Valerian*! — ?
- [*Valerian*] Bis heute kanntest du den frank'schen Grafen
- [215] So gut wie nicht. Und nun steht ihr zusammen
Als hattet ihr euch längst gekannt, *Rotrudis*?
- [*Rotrudis*] Wir kennen uns seitdem wir Kinder waren
- [*Valerian*] Du und der Graf
- [*Rotrudis*] Ich und Chlotar
- [*Valerian*] Wie sprichst du
Wie blickst du — wie so strahlend
- [*Rotrudis*] *Valerian*
- [220] Ich gehe fort von hier.
- [*Valerian*] Du gehst? von hier?

197-198. Three pages of the notebook have been cut out carefully at this point. The context is made clear, however, by the preceding lines.

- Du fort? du mir entrissen? soll das heissen . .
 Nein! nein es ist unmöglich — ist nichts mehr
 Auf Erden fest und heilig, deine Worte
 Rotrudis nicht, nicht die Verträge die uns
- [225] Vermahlen?
 [Rotrudis] Sie sind aufgelöst
 [Valerian] Gelöst?
 Und ich das Opfer dieses höllischen Verrathes
 Weiss nichts davon? Und ich soll dich verlieren?
 Und soll zu gleicher Zeit ein fremder Dieb
 Das Reich mir stehlen und hinausgestossen
- [230] Hab' ich nichts mehr als die Erinnerung einzig
 All der Verbrechen die an mir geschehn sind.
 [Rotrudis] Valerian, Chlotar ruhr deine Krone
 Nicht an. Er geht mit mir?
 [Valerian] Er geht mit dir?
 [Rotrudis] Mein Vater schickt ihn mich zurückzufordern
- [235] Und in mein Vaterland zu fuhren.
 [Valerian] Er?
 Stehn so die Dinge plötzlich? Er mit dir?
 Es ist 'ne Lüge dass er bleibt? Es wäre
 Eine Lüge was sich jedermann erzählt
 Eine Lüge, was *ich* sehe, wie sie alle
- [240] Sich vor ihm beugen? seine kunftige Grösse
 Auswitternd schon den Saum des Mantels ihm
 Mit Ehrfurcht küssen in Gedanken — den er
 Bald tragen wird — Nein du bleibst hier — wir beide
 Betrogen stehn in ehrerbietgem Schweigen
- [245] Wie die geringsten Sklaven und es haschen
 Wie sie ein gnädig Lächeln.
 [Rotrudis] Meine Hand
 Niemals wird das geschehn. Nie wird Chlotar
 Gemahl der Kaisrin wenn sies alle sagen
 Sie lügen alle.

221. Du fort? fort aus Byzanz, soll das bedeuten . . . ?; Du wolltest mich verlassen? soll das heissen . . . ? 226: das Opfer der höllischen Verrätherei

234-239: The following lines were written on a folded sheet of letter paper contained in the notebook:

- [Rot.] Mein Vater schickt ihn mich zurückzufordern
 Und in die Heimath wieder zu geleiten
 [Val.] Stehn so die Dinge plötzlich? und es ist
 'Ne Lüge was sich jedermann erzählt
 'Ne Lüge wenn ich sehe wie sie alle etc.

On the back of this sheet Grimm wrote in pencil: "I send through the prussian closed mail to Mr. Ralph Waldo Emerson at Concord."

- [*Valerian*] Weisst du das gewiss?
 [250] Du weisst's wohl weil *er's* sagte — Sahst *du* sie
 Zusammen beide — sahst Irenens Augen
 Wollüstig auf ihm ruhn wie auf dem Meere
 Die Sonne ruht und voll in sich zurückstrahlt?
 Und um sie her die niederen Gestirne
 [255] Nachwandelnd ihre Bahn — *ihn* zwischen denen
 Als überblickt er ruhig, längstgewohnt
 Sein Eigenthum?
 [*Rotrudis*] [*vor sich hin*] (O, vor den Augen hab' ichs
 Mit glühnden Farben)
 [*Valerian*] Hast du das nicht gesehen?
 Wohlan *ich* seh's mit an?
 [*Rotrudis*] [*vor sich hin*] (Nein, nein ich darf
 [260] Nicht langer horen was Chlotar beleidigt.) [*Rotrudis*
ab]
 [*Valerian*] Sie ginge in ihr Vaterland erzählt sie?
 Gelost sei der Vertrag? Chlotar? — — was gab ihr
 Die Sicherheit, die Kälte? — und sie sprachen
 Hier miteinander, kennen sich sagt sie
 [265] Von Jugend auf — Er hat ihr das gesagt
 Er kame sie holen und er ginge
 Mit ihr zurück — es steigt mir eine Ahnung
 Von Trug und Lüge auf — wagt dieser Schurke
 Den Thron mir zu entreissen und zugleich
 [270] Rotrudis? Dunkel schlingen sich die Wege
 Noch durcheinander und ich will nicht sagen

ARTHUR H. HUGHES

Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.

261-271: Although the manuscript of *Rotrudis* comes to an abrupt end with line 271, the following lines, written in a blank space on one of the preceding pages, are evidently meant as a correction or continuation of the last speech by Valerian:

Sie geht. Gelost die Bande — der Vertrag
 O was braucht *ich's* zu wissen — und sie kennt ihn
 Von Jugend auf — Zuerst gar nicht, zuerst
 Hatt' sie ihn an gesehen und nun dies Glück
 Und diese Sicherheit und diese Kälte
 Mit der sie sagt er ginge mit ihr fort
 Es [wär'] nichts zwischen ihm und meiner Mutter
 Teufel — wie stinkt die Lüge! will er beide
 Besitzen, sie verführen? welche aber
 Von ihnen? und zu welchem Endzweck thut er's?
 O und Rotrudis macht sich von mir los
 Streift mich leicht ab als hatt ich ein Recht
 Gehabt auf sie und ich, ich stehe hier etc. [!]

THE FACTOR OF GENERATION IN GERMAN LITERARY HISTORY

All theory aside and for the practical purposes of this article we may define a generation as an age group, a group of artists who were born about the same time, grew into a similar environment, met each phase of literary and cultural change at the same stage in life development, were confronted with the same problems, consequently acquired a similar vital sensitiveness, and produced works which have a common character recognizable in spite of all differences in quality, manner, background, and individuality.

There are always three or more age groups literarily active at any given time, their life spans overlap in part, certain events and experiences come to all of them. Yet each age group will be affected differently because it will face any given event at a different stage in its development and will therefore assimilate it differently. Any group of years represents the completion of one age group's life work, the height of another's mature power, the rising recognition of a third, and perhaps the early attempts of a fourth. Any chronological *date* will mean three or four different *times*, in spite of a certain positive or negative accommodation of all groups to the reigning outward fashions and tendencies.

With this in mind let us now review two fairly extensive generational series in German literature; first one from older literature around 1200 (despite some lack of accurate data) and then one from more modern literature around the year 1800, so that we can see how this method of arrangement works in different eras and under different circumstances.

The main problem of the literary age groups around the year 1200 was the creation of a secular chivalric literature. The special problem of the precursor generations, in the lyric and in the epic, was twofold: 1. the importation of new materials and forms from Romance countries, 2. the reworking of the indigenous material to conform to the new style and conventions. This was accomplished, it would seem, by three age groups, from (1) the more or less indigenous minstrel epic and the indigenous knightly lyric (Kurenberger), through (2) the Romance epic (Heinrich von Veldeke, Eilhard von Oberg) and the transition lyric (Dietmar von Eist), to (3) the first synthesis of old and new, German and

Romance, in the so-called folk epic (*Nibelungenlied*) and in the lyric (Reinmar von Hagenau, Heinrich von Morungen). This last precursor generation, at its height in the 1180's and 90's, extends into the thirteenth century, ending when the next, the classical generation, was at its height and the first post-classical was just beginning.

The classical generation made use of the newly acquired forms and materials with ease, distinction, and originality, no longer uncertain in technique or timidly imitative. Four poets, all born around 1170, are outstanding: Hartmann von Aue, Walther von der Vogelweide, Wolfram von Eschenbach, and Gottfried von Strassburg, named in the order of their appearance on the literary scene (c. 1190-1210). They solved their common problem, the creation of a high chivalric German literature, with a different stress on the two elements, chivalric and German. Hartmann and Gottfried, formalists both, stressed the chivalric, the perfect expression of the ideals of knighthood and *Minne*. Walther and Wolfram, knights and masters of form though they were, stressed the German, the vital content, in the synthesis they achieved.

Down from this height and into other regions led three courses: 1. imitation and revival, 2. exaggeration, perversion, and shifted emphasis (making peripheral and minor tendencies central), and 3. revolt from old toward new ideals (here religious and bourgeois). These three courses fluctuated in dominance for the age groups to follow, there was no straightforward progress or succession.

The first post-classical generation, born in the 1180's and 90's illustrates this well. Neidhart von Reuenthal changed *niedere Minne* from a diversion to a program. Thomasin von Zirclare and Freidank found it necessary to codify the rules of fine chivalric society, since the living example of it was disappearing. Old Wernher der Gartner, pessimist, reactionary, realist, delineates unforgettably this chivalric decline and vulgarization. Der Stricker, of lighter weight, could first imitate chivalric romance and then forecast new trends in his *Pfaffe Amis* and other works.

The next generation, born around 1200, was largely imitative, epigonic. Tannhauser, the self-indulgent nobleman, took advantage of both his old station and the new circumstances. Reinmar von Zweter was a rather timid imitator of the *Spruchdichter* Walther. Rudolf von Ems fluctuated between worldly romance and religious legend, as Hartmann had done. Ulrich von Lichtenstein,

like Don Quixote, tried single-handed to revive the ideals of chivalry in life as well as in poetry.

The third post-classical generation, born around 1210, was by contrast anti-chivalric. The preaching friar, Berthold von Regensburg, used the new expressiveness of the German language to combat its creators: chivalric society. The mystic, Mechtild von Magdeburg similarly turned the poetic symbolism of the Minnesong heavenward.

The fourth, born around 1230, was epigonic and also synthetic, in combining what remained vital of chivalry with the new bourgeois and religious ideals. The burgher Konrad von Wurzburg in his diverse and many-sided activity was typical for this generation. Albrecht von Scharfenberg exaggerated Wolfram's manner into mannerism, and old Hugo von Trimberg became an indiscriminate anthologist of the past.

Then came another religious, mystical generation, then an essentially burgher generation, then the great mystical generation about Meister Eckhart, and so on in successive waves with burgher and cleric becoming more and more prominent.

The second generational series around 1800 started out as the first had; the predecessor generations were confronted with the problem of fructifying German literature with new forms and materials, this time brought over from Antiquity, from England, from the Romance countries, and from Germany's own past.

The first preparatory generation born around 1700 indicated that the English and old German tendencies would triumph over the Romance in the new classical literature (Bodmer and Breitinger *versus* Gottsched). The second generation born around 1715 may be divided between the formalists and refiners of the German language (Hagedorn, Haller, Gellert, Gleim, Uz) and the thinkers and critics (Winckelmann and Möser) whose ideas were to give direction to the coming classical literature. The third born around 1730 developed fine critical and technical means and also created significant and lasting literary works of its own, formal models for the succeeding generations: Klopstock in poetry, Lessing in drama, criticism, and aesthetics; Wieland in the novel, in those lighter, graceful forms which counterbalanced the almost ponderous profundity of his generation, Kant in no form, but in thought, in the new ethics, and Hamann in his amazingly keen new vital sensitivity.

The next, the first classical generation, born around 1745, came on the literary scene as a youth movement, with a large number of representatives, many of whom lost all creative impulse after the great youthful upsurge of the *Sturm und Drang*. Those who survived developed their style and attitude rather considerably and entered upon their mature phase, which was generally classicistic. A very few, of importance only Goethe, in their old age passed through a third phase which resembled Romanticism but is distinguishable from it. These age phases, which complicate the generational picture, are present in every age group, but are especially apparent here. Among the important members of this first classical generation are Fritz Jacobi, Herder, and Heinse, H. L. Wagner, Burger, Mahler Muller, and Goethe, Lenz, Voss, and Klinger.

The second classical generation born around 1760 is much smaller in numbers, and very different in literary purpose and expression. It includes Schiller, Fichte, and Jean Paul, who in their different ways were deeply involved in thought and expression in the stirring events of their time; the same age group in France furnished the leaders of the Revolution. These writers are idealistic, didactic, ethical, metaphysical, revolutionary; in one instance the turmoil, the chaos of the time was modified into humor. They are in decided contrast to the individualistic, lyric, natural generation which preceded them.

Following these two classical generations, one lyrical, the other metaphysical, there are two equally different Romantic generations in reverse order, the first more intellectual and philosophical, the second more lyric and creative. The first group born around 1770 includes the Schlegel brothers and their wives, Schleiermacher, Holderlin, and Hegel, Novalis, Tieck, and Wackenroder. Many in this age group passed through classicism as a youthful phase, and then a few years before the turn of the century quickly changed to Romanticism, at a time when Goethe and Schiller were at the height of their classicistic phase.

The second Romantic generation, born around 1780, no longer theorized about Romanticism, but took it for granted and preceded creatively rather than critically. It was far more indigenous, earth bound, German. It includes Schelling, Gorres, E. T. A. Hoffmann, Kleist, Brentano, Arnim, Bettina, the brothers Grimm, Uhland, Eichendorff.

The men of the next generation born around 1795 reacted against Romanticism in two different ways. 1. some like Grillparzer, Eckermann, W. Müller, Platen harked back to the classicistic tendencies of the Goethe or Schiller generation, 2. others pointed ahead to *Junges Deutschland* and to realism with their modernizing or their regional tendencies, among these are Heine and Grabbe, and the regionalists Immermann, Droste-Hülshoff, Jeremias Gotthelf, and Willibald Alexis.

The following may be called the last Romantic generation; its members were born around 1803 and were of a highly refined, detailed, miniaturistic expression, a Romanticism which is often a luminous realism. Representatives are Lenau, Morike, and Stifter.

Then about 1815 came a dramatic, revolutionary generation, very sensitive to the "Zeitgeist," expressing this either in direct political writing and activity or sublimating it in creations of ideological drama or of realistic regional novel. It is again large in numbers and in importance, there are Freiligrath and Gutzkow, four of the great German dramatists of the 19th century all born in 1813: Ludwig, Hebbel, Wagner, and Buchner, the novelists Reuter, Freytag, Storm, Keller, Fontane, and the historians and political theorists Mommsen, Burkhardt, and Marx.

Then comes an idealistic, anti-realistic, "Romanticoid" generation born around 1830 including C. F. Meyer, Scheffel, Spielhagen, Heyse, Dahn, Ebers, the humorists Raabe and Busch, and critics and historians like Dilthey and Treitschke, who were German and nationalistic in contrast to the internationalists of the previous generation.—And so it goes on through the following Impressionistic generation (Liliencron, Nietzsche, Spitteler) to the generations which extend to the present time.

There are a number of interesting parallels and contrasts to be observed in these two generational series. There is a similar course of development toward a high point in German literature, and a similar wave-like course of development away from the ideals and standards of the classical generation and toward something else. In both cases the high point is not realism, but a kind of idealism which is *later* followed by a contrasting realism. There are in both series the several pioneer generations, the last of which already creates works of classical stature, there are the one or two classical generations, and the declining series of rebels, imitators, innovators, and modifiers.

What, in conclusion are the chief contributions to literary history of the generational method of arrangement? 1. There is first and foremost the vivid picture it offers of the real movement of literary history. that its speed is quite as rapid and radical in old literature as in new, despite popular assumption to the contrary; that its manner is complex and fluctuating, that the conventional methods of presentation, which take up, say, the whole chivalric movement first in epic then in lyric, then take up the whole religious movement, then the realistic or bourgeois movement, are quite artificial.

2. There is in the concept of generation an intermediary unit between the all too small historical unit of the individual and the all too large and complex historical unit of the epoch. On the one hand the individual is brought into natural relation to other individuals of similar life span and vital sensitiveness, and on the other hand the structural make-up of the epoch is clearly revealed.

3. Thus it is evident that the generational method should not interfere with the consideration of a poet's individuality, but should rather aid in it, since it will distinguish between those characteristics which belong to his generation as a whole and those which are truly his own, even as it will also show clearly how the different individualities react to the same set of temporal circumstances.

4. The method will also group the writers sensibly; it will relegate to its proper place the popular make-shift method of arrangement according to literary genre, which tends to wrench apart all natural relations between contemporaries. Genre is a non-historical literary factor, and should be treated as such in literary history.

5. Current literary categories will also be subjected to critical examination. For instance, *Sturm und Drang*, *Klassik*, *Romantik* are clearly not equivalent terms, the first is the youthful phase of expression of one age group, the second is the mature phase of expression of two different age groups, the third is a far broader term than either, since it includes the life expression of at least two generations and even refers to a literary tendency to be found in other generations. Over against such an incommensurate series of categories we have in the generations a completely equivalent series which will not replace the conventional categories but will help interpret them correctly.

6. The generational method used with discrimination will also furnish us with a surer and more usable means of literary comparison and contrast, whether this contrast be between different epochs of the same literature, between different arts of the same epoch, or between different national literatures of the same epoch.

The undesirable or dangerous features about the generational arrangement of literary history lie in its exclusive, unmodified application in the hands of an extremist. A poet can never be characterized merely by relegating him to an age group, nor can a history of literature be written exclusively in terms of generation. Generation is after all only *one* of the important factors entering into the structure of literary history, and its exclusive use would be just as reprehensible as is the omission of it in most histories of literature. Generation is a convenient and consistent *temporal* unit of arrangement, even as region (*Stamm und Landschaft*) is a convenient *constant* unit of arrangement, and a history of literature which should use these two with the proper discretion as structural elements, would have that "Darstellungsnotwendigkeit" which Nadler demanded theoretically, but only half carried out in practice.

HAROLD S. JANTZ

Clark University

DER BRUCH IN KLEISTS *PENTHESILEA*

Unter den zahlreichen Deutungsversuchen von Kleists *Penthesilea* lassen sich zwei Grundrichtungen unterscheiden.¹ Auf der einen Seite finden wir den Versuch, das Drama als eine reine Tragödie der Leidenschaft zu erklären. "In Kleists *Penthesilea* zum ersten Male schweigt die Vernunft, waltet garkein Kampf zwischen Gesetz und Leidenschaft, sondern die Leidenschaft, und zwar die noch unvergeistigte triebhafte, vernichtet sich selbst, nicht durch Gericht einer sie überwaltenden Vernunft," sagt Gundolf,² und ihm folgt Blankenagel, wenn er ausführt: "Neither Penthesilea nor Achilles wages a conflict between the dictates of reason and the white heat

¹ Eine andersartige, in diesem Zusammenhang aber nicht verwendbare Einteilung nimmt Wolfg. Einsiedel vor (*Die dramatische Charaktergestaltung bei Kleist*, S. 53).

² *Heinrich von Kleist*, S. 101.

of desire. They are devoid of rational faculties, incapable of deliberation, reflection or even choice. Impetuously and blindly they follow their instinctive bent.”³ “Der Liebeskampf, der zur Raserei ausartet,” ist nach Karl Federn⁴ Inhalt des Dramas und ähnliche Ansichten aussern auch alle diejenigen, die Kleist von einem mehr poetischen⁵ als literarischen Standpunkt aus zu erfassen suchen.⁶ Das Gegenteil wird von dem anderen Grundtypus der Interpretationen *Penthesileas* behauptet: nicht die Leidenschaft allein, sondern der Kampf zwischen Gesetz und den natürlichen Gefühlen des Individuums sei es, der den Gehalt des Werkes bilde. Dabei lassen sich drei Untergruppen scheiden: Die einen sehen im Tode Penthesileas die Bestrafung ihrer Leidenschaften, die sich gegen das Gesetz gewendet haben, erklären also das Individuum für schuldig, sodass sein Tod als der Sieg des Gesetzes erscheint,⁷ die Anhänger der zweiten Gruppe behaupten gerade das Gegenteil, dass hier nämlich ein unschuldig Individuum an einem sinnlosen Gesetz zugrunde gegangen sei, dass am Ende somit das Gesetz, nicht der Mensch gerichtet sei⁸ und schliesslich ist noch der dritte Versuch gemacht worden, das Drama als den Kampf zwischen zwei gleichberechtigten Faktoren aufzufassen,⁹ in dem das Gesetz objektiv durch den Tod Penthesileas

³ *The Dramas of Heinrich von Kleist*, S. 131.

⁴ *Das Leben Heinrich von Kleists*, S. 193.

⁵ So Stephan Zweig: *Kampf mit dem Damon*, S. 191; Arnold Zweig: *Lessing, Kleist, Buchner*, S. 120

⁶ Andere Vertreter dieser Ansicht sind: Witkop: *Kleist*, S. 123 ff., insbes 134; Unger, Rudolf: *Herder, Novalis, Kleist*, S. 132 f.; Julius Bab: *Kleist*, S. 34 ff., insbes 38; A. Eloesser *Deutsche Litt.* II, S. 64. Auch Herzog (*Kleist*, S. 380 ff.) gehört wohl hierher, wie überhaupt die meisten Autoren zu dieser Ansicht neigen.

⁷ So Roger Ayrault: *Heinrich v. Kleist*, S. 359; Maximilian Harden in: *Die Zukunft* 18. Jahrgg., S. 354; Franz Servaes: *H. v. Kleist*, S. 91, der Suhrnung durch Selbstvernichtung in Penthesileas Schicksal erblickt, und Collin (*Das Tragische in Kleists Leben und Kunst*, S. 781 ff.), der von der “Tragodie überstiegener, verblendeter Selbstherrlichkeit” spricht.

⁸ So wohl Braig (*Kleist* S. 221), wenn er sagt “Und so sah Kleist das grosse tragische Problem in der Wiedergewinnung der verlorenen metaphysischen Freiheit der Frauen, der Menschheit in ihnen” Eindeutiger Helene Stöcker in: *Die Liebe und die Frau*, 2. Aufl. S. 169 f.

⁹ Meyer-Benfey, *Kleist*, II, S. 356 ff. (Kampf zwischen Amazonin und liebendem Weibe), Walter Silz; *Kleists Conception of the Tragic*, S. 38 ff., allerdings zuweilen mit der Idee, Penthesilea für schuldig zu erklären.

siegt, subjektiv aber von ihr überwunden wird, weil sie nicht um des Gesetzes, sondern um ihrer Liebe willen stirbt¹⁰

Es lässt sich leicht erkennen, warum diese Auslegungen nicht befriedigen können. Die erste Gruppe, die es allein auf die sich selbst vernichtende Leidenschaft abstellt, geht an der Tatsache vorbei, dass die ersten 20 Auftritte allein der Auseinandersetzung zwischen Individuum und Gesetz gewidmet sind und man nicht berechtigt ist, diesen Teil des Dramas zu übergehen. Die langwierige und schmerzvolle Auseinandersetzung zwischen dem Amazonengesetz und Penthesileas Gefühl muss eine andere Bedeutung haben als die einer blossen Vorbereitung, sie nimmt räumlich bei weitem den überwiegenden Teil der Dichtung ein und ist ein essentieller Bestandteil des Dramas, sodass jede Auslegung, die diesen Teil vernachlässigt, keinen Anspruch auf eine volle Erfassung des Dramas erheben kann.

Entsprechendes gilt von der zweiten Gruppe der Auslegungen. Indem sie den Kampf von Gefühl und Gesetz als den Gehalt des Dramas betrachten, werden sie zwar den ersten 20 Auftritten gerecht, aber nicht der Tatsache, dass sich die Katastrophe nicht aus diesem Kampf ergibt. Schon im 19. Auftritt ist das Gesetz von Penthesilea überwunden worden sie flucht ihrer Befreiung (2298 ff.) und wird daraufhin von der Oberpriesterin, der fleischlichen Verkörperung des Amazonengesetzes, von diesem Gesetz losgesprochen (2329 ff.). Die Auseinandersetzung mit dem Gesetz ist also an dieser Stelle tatsächlich zu Ende. Dem entspricht auf Seiten Achilles, dass er sich ebenfalls in diesem Stadium von den Geboten der Vernunft gelöst hat, indem er den Trojanerkrieg Penthesileas wegen aufgeben will. Auch in ihm hat also das Gefühl, die Liebe, den Sieg errungen. Das Problem des Dramas wäre somit an dieser Stelle gelöst, wenn nicht Penthesilea die Botschaft des Achilles missverstande und in ihr dadurch der irrige Glaube wachgerufen würde, dass nur sie, nicht aber der Geliebte der Liebe alles geopfert habe. In diesem *Missverständnis*, nicht aber im Gesetz selber liegt die Ursache der Katastrophe. Die Behauptung, dass Penthesilea am Gesetz zugrunde gehe, gleichgültig, wer schuldig ist, wird damit also hinfallig, da die Norm nicht selber ihren Tod herbeiführt. Dies wäre aber unbedingt notwendig, denn wenn das Gesetz nicht

¹⁰ Diese Varierung ist von Fricke, Gerhard: *Gefühl und Schicksal bei Kleist*, S 97 ff. vorgeschlagen worden.

von sich aus das abtrünnige Individuum strafen kann, wäre man gezwungen, hier die Wirksamkeit einer transzendenten Macht anzunehmen, die dem unterliegenden Gesetz zu Hilfe kommt. Nun sind zwar transzendente Mächte Kleist keineswegs fremd, wie *Amphitryon* und *Katchen von Heilbronn* beweisen, aber es kann keinem Zweifel unterliegen, dass *Penthesilea* von jeder Beziehung auf jenseitige Gewalten frei ist und frei sein soll. Nichts berechtigt zur Annahme eines geheimnisvollen, über den Personen stehenden Schicksals, das in die Welt des Dramas eingreift, und damit fällt ein adäquater Kausalnexus zwischen der Gesetzesübertretung und der Katastrophe weg. Das Gesetz ist eine der Ursachen der schliesslichen Katastrophe, es ist sogar eine *conditio sine qua non*, da sich ohne es eine derartige Lage nicht hatte entwickeln können, aber es bedarf noch eines ganz entscheidenden und aus dem Gesetz selbst nicht erkläraren Umstandes, um zu dem gegebenen Ende zu kommen. Wallenstein stirbt z. B. am Gesetz, da dessen Verletzung sofort den Racher auf den Plan ruft, der die beleidigte Ordnung wieder herstellt, demselben Schicksal unterliegen Hero und Leander (*Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen*); *König Ottokars Glück und Ende* ist ausschliesslich durch seine jeweilige Haltung zum Gesetz bestimmt; aber Kleists Liebespaar stirbt nicht, weil es das Gesetz gebrochen, sondern sich missverstanden hat. Jede Interpretation der zweiten Gruppe kann daher nur teilweise richtig sein, denn sie kann dem zweiten Teil des Dramas, das mit dem Missverständnis der Botschaft Achills im 20. Auftritt einsetzt, nicht gerecht werden und die Katastrophe selbst nicht erklären.

Ist nun mit diesem negativen Resultat die Möglichkeit einer rationalen Analyse des Dramas überhaupt in Frage gestellt? Man wäre an sich geneigt, diese Frage im negativen Sinne zu beantworten, wenn nicht die Tatsache, dass alle Interpretationen an ein und demselben Punkte, dem Missverständnis der Botschaft des Achilles, scheitern, einen Fingerzeig gäbe, wo weitere Untersuchungen einzusetzen haben. Wenn überhaupt eine Lösung des Penthesilearatsels möglich ist, dann muss sie in der Erkenntnis der Bedeutung dieses Ereignisses liegen.

Schon Meyer-Benfey macht darauf aufmerksam, dass an dieser Stelle eine gewisse Casus vorliege.¹¹ Nach seiner Auffassung besitzt das Drama drei Teile, Auftritt 1-3 Vorspiel, 3-19 erster

¹¹ Kleist, I, S. 536.

Hauptteil, 20 bis Schluss zweiter Hauptteil. Man könnte schon bei dieser Feststellung stutzig werden, denn wenn jedes Drama notwendigerweise in eine Exposition (Stellung des Problems) und eine Haupthandlung (Lösung des Problems) zerfällt, so ist diese Dreiteilung, d. h. eine Auflösung der Haupthandlung in zwei Teile, sehr seltsam und stellt einen direkten Verstoss gegen das Gesetz der Einheit der Handlung dar. So wenig man die klassischen Regeln über die Einheiten der Zeit und des Raums im Drama als allgemeinverbindlich anerkennen kann, so wenig lässt sich an der dritten Einheit rütteln; die Einheit der Intrigue, des Problems, ist ein absolut notwendiges und niemals ernsthaft bestrittenes Erfordernis jeder dramatischen Dichtung. Und dass diese sonderbare Casur nicht nur gegen eine abstrakte Regel verstösst, sondern auch von dem Dichter selbst als zweifelhaft empfunden worden ist, beweist die Tatsache, dass er bei der Publikation des Penthesileafragments im *Phobus* gerade mit dem Vers 2584 im 22. Auftritt abbrach, d. h. mit dem Triumphgeschrei der Amazonen über den Sturz des Achilles und der Aussicht, dass die Siegerin seinen Scheitel mit Rosenkranzen wird,¹² sodass Achill entsprechend seinem Wunsch gefangen und das Liebespaar schliesslich doch noch vereint erscheint. Kleist schloss also genau vor dem Moment, in dem die mit dem Missverständnis einsetzende neue Kausalität ihre ersten verderblichen Wirkungen zu zeigen anfangt.¹³ Wenn er dazu an Goethe schreibt: "So, wie es hier steht, wird man vielleicht die Prämissen, als möglich, zugeben müssen, und nachher nicht erschrecken, wenn die Folgerungen gezogen werden,"¹⁴ so liegt in dem "vielleicht" sein eigener Zweifel ausgedrückt, ob das von ihm geplante Ende wirklich mit der vorhergehenden Handlung übereinstimmt, ob es, mit anderen Worten, wirklich mit Notwendigkeit aus den Prämissen folgt.

Und tatsächlich folgt das Ende nicht mit Notwendigkeit aus den Prämissen. Die Katastrophe stellt sich als eine Wirkung des Umstandes dar, dass Penthesilea sich über die wirkliche Mentalität des Griechen, über die Grosse seiner Liebe und seiner Opferbereitschaft völlig im Unklaren ist und in der Herausforderung zum Zweikampf nur die Äusserung des brutalen Überlegenen, der voll Hohn auf den Schwächeren herabblickt, sehen kann. Dieser Irrtum der Königin ist nun zwar noch in der Botschaft Achills klar

¹² *Phobus*, 1. Stuck, S. 33.

¹³ *Werke*, Bd. V, S. 370.

begründet, vollig unverständlich ist es aber, wie dieser zu einer solchen Formulierung seiner Botschaft kommen konnte. Der Kampf mit Penthesilea soll nach seiner Absicht nur zum Schein stattfinden und hierbei stehen nun drei Möglichkeiten offen: 1.) die Königin soll den Scheincharakter des Kampfes überhaupt nicht bemerken, sondern an eine wirkliche Überwindung glauben, 2.) sie soll den Scheincharakter während des Kampfes erkennen, 3.) sie soll schon der Botschaft selber anmerken, in welchem Geiste sie abgefasst worden ist. An welche dieser drei Möglichkeiten Kleist gedacht hat, bleibt unklar. Aus der Botschaft selbst lässt sich nicht entnehmen, dass es sich nur um einen Scheinkampf handeln soll, denn Achill betont ja gerade die Unvereinbarkeit seiner eigenen Wünsche mit denen Penthesileas (2358 ff.) und kündigt einen "Kampf auf Tod und Leben" an (2362), so dass hier nur ein entschiedener Wille zum Kampf, aber auch nicht die leiseste Andeutung seiner wahren Absichten zum Ausdruck kommt. Dass ausserdem ein Mensch wie die Amazonenkönigin sich auf eine blosser Farce kaum eingelassen hatte, ist evident. Die Botschaft soll also den Scheincharakter des Kampfes offenbar noch nicht verraten. Dann musste sich aber Achill darüber klar sein, was eine ernst scheinende Herausforderung in diesem Moment für Penthesilea bedeuten musste, dass sie darin nur eine Verhöhnung ihrer zartesten Gefühle sehen konnte und dass sie, wenn sie den Kampf daraufhin annahm, ihn mit der grössten Erbitterung und nur beseelt von dem Wunsche, die angetane Schmach zu rachen, führen würde. Dem steht aber die Tatsache gegenüber, dass Achill den Kampf nur als ein Kinderspiel ansieht, denn wie Meroe nachtraglich erzählt, hatte er "nur zum Schein mit einem Spiess sich arglos ausgerüstet (2470)." Er hält also eine Verteidigung für völlig überflüssig, er ist, wie er selbst sagt, überzeugt davon, dass Penthesilea ihm nichts tun wird (2470 ff.):

". . . Eh wird ihr Arm
Im Zweikampf gegen Ihren Busen wuten
Und rufen: "Sieg!" wenn er von Herzblut trieft
Als wider mich!"

Selbst als der Herold das Nahen Penthesileas verkundet und ihren kriegerischen Aufzug beschreibt, ist Achill seiner Sache noch völlig sicher, ohne dass es auch nur andeutungsweise ersichtlich wird, worauf sich diese Sicherheit gegenüber einem sich verletzt glaubenden Feinde stützt, ja er sieht sogar entsprechend seinen Worten

(2539 ff.) diesen Aufzug nur als eine List Penthesileas an und ist überzeugt, dass ihre furchterlichen Hunde aus der Hand fressen (2545). Dementsprechend scheidet also die zweite und dritte der angegebenen Möglichkeiten aus, da Achilles gegenüber einem bis aufs ausserste gereizten Feind weder diese Sicherheit haben konnte noch es wagen durfte, ihm ungerüstet gegenüber zu treten, sondern deutlich taucht an dieser Stelle die Vorstellung auf, dass Achill seine wahren Absichten schon in der Herausforderung zum Kampf angedeutet habe, eine Möglichkeit, die aus den vorher gezeigten Gründen aber ebenfalls ausscheidet.

Wie man die Absichten Achills auch zu erklären sucht, sie bleiben unklar und widerspruchsvoll. Nun entscheidet aber gerade diese Stelle über den Ausgang des Dramas, denn sobald Penthesilea erfahren wurde, dass Achills Herausforderung keine Schmahung, sondern ein Opfer ist, wurde die Katastrophe nicht eintreten, sie wurde auch dann nicht eintreten, wenn ihr Achill voll gerüstet gegenüberträte und ihr dann während des Kampfes seine Absicht zu verstehen geben würde. Aus unverständlichen Gründen schneidet aber Achill jede Möglichkeit der Rettung ab, indem er die Königin erst aufs ausserste reizt und ihr dann unbewaffnet gegenübertritt. Es liegt hier ein volliger Mangel an Motivierung vor, es entfällt infolgedessen die Notwendigkeit des Geschehensablaufs, die unbedingtes Erfordernis jeder Tragik ist, es liegt kein Nur-so-und-nicht-anders-sein-können vor, und somit beruht die Katastrophe auf einer unbegründeten Gedankenlosigkeit Achills. Wir haben es hier also mit dem nicht häufigen und stets schwer erkennbaren Phänomen eines psychologischen Zufalls zu tun, d. h. eines Zufalls in der Motivierung eines Entschlusses, der in seiner praktischen Auswirkung dem gewöhnlichen Ereigniszufall völlig gleich steht. Nun braucht ein Zufall an sich keine erhebliche Bedeutung zu haben, wie der bekannte Zufall in *Romeo und Julia* beweist, durch den die Botschaft des Bruder Lorenzo an Romeo verhindert wird (1, 2); der Zufall dient hier allein dazu, die Handlung dem schon vorbestimmten Ende schneller zuzuführen. Ganz anders liegt dies aber in *Penthesilea*, der Zufall bedeutet hier nicht nur eine Beschleunigung des Ablaufs, denn da die Handlung ohne sein Dazwischentreten beendet sein würde, bedeutet der Zufall eine völlig neue Exposition, durch die ein neues, aus den vorhergehenden Ereignissen nicht bedingtes Geschehen eingeleitet wird. Es liegt hier also ganz deutlich ein *Bruch in der Handlung* vor, und dieser Bruch ist der

Grund dafür, dass alle Interpretationsversuche, die sich um eine einheitliche Erfassung des Dramas bemühen, scheitern müssen.¹⁴

Ein Bruch in der Handlung bedeutet, dass ein poetischer Geschehensablauf trotz der Gleichheit des äusseren Rahmens, d. h. der Identität der Personen, der zeitlichen Kontinuität, der Gleichheit des Milieus, an einer bestimmten Stelle den Gehalt wechselt und von nun an der inneren Problematik (*l'intrigue*) und dem Sinn des Geschehens nach ein anderer ist als zuvor. Dies ist der Fall in *Penthesilea*. Die Handlung läuft anscheinends stetig weiter, das Schicksal der Amazonin wird von ihrer ersten Begegnung mit Achill bis zu ihrem Tode dargestellt, aber es kann kein Zweifel obwalten, dass hier nacheinander zwei verschiedenen Ideen Ausdruck gegeben ist, wie eine Betrachtung des Gehalts beider Teile zeigt.

Betrachten wir zunächst den ersten Teil.¹⁵ Seine Auslegung schliesst sich der zweiten Gruppe der oben unterschiedenen Interpretationsarten an und behandelt die Auseinandersetzung von Individuum und Gesetz, wobei Kleist, wie stets, auf Seiten des Individuums steht und dessen Rechte gegen Vernunft und Gesetz vertritt. "Der Mensch passt nicht für das Gefäss eines Amtes, wenn ein höheres Feuer ihn erwärmt" so schreibt der Dichter in Beziehung auf sich an Ulrike¹⁶ und so denkt er über Penthesilea und Achill. Mit Sympathie betrachtet er den Prozess der stufenweisen Lösung vom Gesetz, der sich auf beiden Seiten vollzieht. Die innere Auflehnung Penthesileas gegen das Gesetz beginnt im 9. Auftr. (1187), der äussere Bruch folgt sogleich, indem sie ihre Flucht vorsätzlich verzögert und der von der Oberpriesterin (dem Gesetz) nicht verstandenen Stimme ihres Herzens folgt. Noch hat sie aber das Gesetz nicht überwunden, denn als sie aus einer Ohnmacht erwachend Achill sich zu Füssen sieht und ihn gefangen wähnt, gewinnt mit der vermeintlichen Leichtigkeit seiner Erfüllung ihre Treue zum Gesetz wieder die Oberhand in ihr. Sie scheut den Kampf mit der hergebrachten Ordnung und sucht ihn zu vermeiden,

¹⁴ H. Wittig erklärt zwar das Drama einheitlich als Ausdruck von Kleists Ringen um Guiskard, jedoch wird damit, selbst wenn diese Auffassung richtig ist, nur die Einheit einer der inneren Quellen dieser Dichtung, nicht aber die Einheit des Dramas als solchen erklärt (*Das innere Erlebnis H. v. Kleists*: Diss. Greifswald).

¹⁵ Die folgenden Ausführungen beschränken sich auf den kurzen Grundriss einer Interpretation.

¹⁶ Brief vom 25. November 1800, *Werke* Bd. V, S. 37.

solange sie kann. Dasselbe gilt für Achill, der auch zunächst noch hofft, Pflicht und Neigung vereinigen zu können (vgl. sein "Nach Phthia!" im 17. Auftr. 2284).¹⁷ Erst in der nun folgenden Trennung erklimmen die Liebenden die letzte Stufe, indem sie sich endgültig über das Gesetz hinwegsetzen: Penthesilea, indem sie ihrer Befreiung aus den Händen Achills flucht, Achill, indem er sich entschliesst, sich der Amazonin gefangen zu geben. Damit ist das Problem gelöst, der Dichter billigt die Vereinigung der Liebenden gegen Gesetz und Vernunft, der Mensch erweist sich als starker als die abstrakte Norm, die die Vereinigung der Liebenden weder innerlich noch ausserlich verhindern kann.

Anstatt damit abzubrechen entwickelt der Dichter nun eine neue Problematik: So gross sein Vertrauen zu dem natürlichen Lebensgefühl des Individuums ist, so gross ist seine Angst vor der "Gefühlsverwirrung." Penthesilea hat die höchste Stufe dieser Verwirrung erreicht, sie befindet sich in einem Taumel, einem Wahnzustand, der genauso wie bei den Schroffensteinern nur zur allgemeinen Vernichtung führen kann. Hier schweigt entsprechend Gundolfs Wort die Vernunft völlig, es gibt nur "ruhige Ufer, durch welche die entfesselten Ströme Achilles und Penthesilea einander entgegenbrausen," die Leidenschaften regieren hier mit absoluter und von der Vernunft nicht eingeschränkter Gewalt.

Deutlich heben sich also die beiden Teile der Penthesilea-Tragödie voneinander ab: Die Überwindung des Gesetzes durch das Individuum ist der erste Teil des Dramas, die Tragödie der sinnlos entfesselten Leidenschaft sein zweiter. Die innere Verbindung zwischen diesen Teilen ist schwach und damit muss jede Deutung ihren Zweck verfehlen, die an der Tatsache dieses Bruches vorbeigeht.

HANS M. WOLFF

Brown University

¹⁷ Auf die Frage, wie weit Achill eigene Bedeutung hat und wie weit er nur um Penthesileas willen da ist, braucht hier nicht eingegangen zu werden.

PRINZ FRIEDRICH VON HOMBURG AND FREEDOM OF INITIATIVE

The question of the degree of initiative accorded the youthful hero of Kleist's drama *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* has been discussed widely. This question is of importance, for numerous critics maintain either that the drama glorifies authority, or that it proclaims the right to the assertion of individual initiative, or that it mediates between such opposing points of view. Various divergent interpretations made over a period of one hundred years following the publication of the drama were summarized by Hermann Gilow in the year 1922.¹ More recently Professor Heinrich Meyer-Benfey again referred to this much debated issue. He wrote in part:

Der Herrscher verlangt von seinen Untertanen selbstverständlich Gehorsam . . . aber nicht blinden Gehorsam . . . sondern sehenden Gehorsam aus eigener Einsicht und freier Zustimmung. . . . Aber der Herrscher soll auch die Natur des anderen verstehen und ehren und sein Gefühl achten. Damit ist die Forderung blinden Gehorsams unvereinbar. Und Kleists Fürsten handeln wirklich dieser Forderung gemäss. Als Hermann den jungen Luitgar als Boten an Marbod schickt, da teilt er ihm nicht nur den Inhalt des Schreibens mit, das er überbringen soll, sondern er begleitet dies mit einer eingehenden Begründung und vollständigen Darlegung seiner Absichten, fragt ihn um seine Meinung und antwortet seinen Einwänden. Er tut das, damit Luitgar in unvorhergesehenen Fällen selbständig handeln kann. Und zu dem gleichen Zweck teilt der grosse Kurfürst im ersten Akt des "Prinzen von Homburg" nicht nur jedem Truppenführer mit, was er zu tun hat, sondern er lässt den versammelten den ganzen Schlachtentwurf vorlesen, dass jeder das ganze Stück, in dem er eine Rolle hat, und damit die Begründung seiner Aufgabe kennt. Eigenmächtige Entscheidung bei nicht programmgemassem Verlauf, wie er in einer Schlacht immer vorkommen kann, wird also nicht nur nicht verboten, sondern gewünscht und ermöglicht.²

On one fundamental point Meyer-Benfey is in error. Careful scrutiny of the drama does not support his contention that the dictation of the complete plan of battle grows out of the desire of

¹ Hermann Gilow: *Heinrich von Kleists Prinz Friedrich von Homburg 1821-1921. Jahrbuch der Kleist-Gesellschaft 1921* Berlin, Weidmann. 1922 pp. 22-50.

² Heinrich Meyer-Benfey: *Kleists politische Anschauungen. Jahrbuch der Kleist-Gesellschaft 1931 und 1932* Berlin, Weidmann. 1932. p. 22.

the elector to accord freedom of initiative in case the battle does not progress as had been anticipated. Moreover, there is nothing in the orders issued to Homburg which justifies Meyer-Benfey's conclusion that under such unforeseen circumstances intervention is not merely not forbidden, but is desired and rendered possible. For Homburg is told unequivocally as follows.

Des Prinzen Durchlaucht wird—
 Nach unsers Herrn ausdrücklichem Befehl—
 Wie immer auch die Schlacht sich wenden mag
 Vom Platz nicht, der ihm angewiesen, weichen—
 Als bis gedrängt von Hennings und von Truchss—
 Des Feindes linker Flügel, aufgelöst,
 Auf seinen rechten stürzt, und alle seine
 Schlachthaufen wankend nach der Trift sich drängen,
 In deren Sumpfen, oft durchkreuzt von Gräben,
 Der Kriegsplan eben ist, ihn aufzureiben.—
 Dann wird er die Fanfare blasen lassen.—
 Doch wird des Fürsten Durchlaucht ihm, damit,
 Durch Missverständnis, der Schlag zu früh nicht falle—
 Ihm einen Offizier aus seiner Suite senden,
 Der den Befehl, das merkt, ausdrücklich noch
 Zum Angriff auf den Feind ihm überbringe.
 Eh' wird er nicht Fanfare blasen lassen.*

Obviously, Meyer-Benfey is correct in asserting that the reading of the complete plan of battle, of which the above lines form an important part, is to acquaint the assembled leaders with the necessity of relating each individual command to the whole. Yet the elector allows the prince no leeway whatsoever, for he commands Homburg expressly not to leave the place assigned to him, regardless of what may happen, until a certain objective has been reached. Nor does he allow the ardent prince any opportunity to judge for himself the proper moment for the cavalry charge, for the latter is to await a personally transmitted order to attack. The precision of the elector's commands is emphasized by his final injunction that Homburg is to remain calm, and not to jeopardize this victory on which the elector's throne and realm are staked (ll. 348 ff.). The reminder that Homburg had already deprived the elector of two victories renders this admonishment all the more insistent.

* Lines 293 ff. For the sake of clarity the byplay which interrupts the reading of this command has been omitted. The dashes indicate interruptions in the text.

Although he errs in assuming that the elector invites freedom of action, Meyer-Benfey is right in stating that the prince's guilt lies essentially in being impelled to attack by motives of personal ambition and by an urge for action, without consideration of and in opposition to the plan of battle as a whole.⁴ For in spite of assumptions by various critics that an unforeseen turn in the tactical situation justified Homburg's unauthorized attack, there is nothing in the second scene of the second act to indicate that a changed situation prompts the hasty charge. Upon general shouts of triumph and victory Homburg impetuously orders the attack without reference to any change in developments (ll. 468 ff.). His conduct is clearly disobedience in the face of the enemy rather than exercise of initiative left to him by the elector. Moreover, it is so construed by Kottwitz, who reminds Homburg at the time of the charge that he is to wait for the order to attack (ll. 471 ff.), and subsequently by the elector as he summons the arbitrary transgressor before a court-martial (ll. 715 ff.), and when he explains to Kottwitz the unfavorable results of the untimely attack (ll. 1541 ff.).

JOHN C. BLANKENAGEL

Wesleyan University

JEAN PAULS SCHULMEISTER

Vor 125 Jahren—im Jahre 1812—erschien ein kleines Buch, von dem der Verfasser in der Vorrede sagte: "Einige wenige harmlose, schuldlose, lichte, glanzlose Leute mit ähnlichen Schicksalen durchleben. . . . ein leises graues laues Abendregnen, unter welchem statt der Blumen die unscheinbare Erde ausduftet, wozu höchstens noch ein Fingerbreit Abendrot und drei Strahlen Abendstern kommen mochten." Es ist die Lebensgeschichte "des berühmten Herrn Gotthelf Fibel, Verfasser des neuen Markgräfluster, frankischen, Voigtlandischen und kurhessischen ABC Buches" von Jean Paul Richter.

Jean Paul gehört zu den seltsam beflugelten Menschen wie Hölderlin und Kleist, die schwer an den durchschnittlichen Massstäben der literaturgeschichtlichen Terminologie gemessen werden

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 22.

und Ämtern der Kundmachungen der Begriff der staatlichen Ordnung. Aus der Enge der Wohnstube ergibt sich das Erlebnis des Weltraums und aus dem Ablauf des Kirchenjahres das Bewusstsein für Zeit und Raum.

Diese Helden der *Wochentäglichkeiten* sind die Schulmeister, Subrektoren und Pfarrherren, Menschen wie Wuz, Fixlein, Senior und Fibel. Es sind die Lehrer, die die ganze Schule liebt, weil sie nicht donnern sondern spielen weil ihnen alles Lehren mehr "ein Warmen als ein Saen" ist. Es sind die lachelnden Menschen, denen wir wieder zulacheln müssen, die eine warme Stube lieben, die Fensterflora und die Dammerstunden. Es sind die Menschen, die über jedes Staubchen Belege, Quittungen und Kontrakte ausstellen, die ihr eigener Tintenkoch sind und für die die Wäschezeichen der Mutter die ersten Inkunabeln waren. Es sind die Menschen, die in Trinkgeldern genau, in Kaufschillingen gerecht und in Almosen verschwenderisch sind. Es sind die Knaben, die wie Wuz alle Ausnahmen der Grammatik kennen, aber keine Regeln, die noch als alte Knaben Robinson lieber lesen als Homer. Die Kunst frohlich zu sein ist ihre oberste Kunst. Und der 3. Paragraph dieser Kunst hiess für Wuz: ich wurde verliebt. Sie freuen sich beim Aufstehn auf das Mittagessen und beim Mittagstisch auf das Vesperläuten. Sie führen wie Wuz nur ein Einnahme- aber kein Ausgabenbuch. Sie halten junge Vögel und Pflanzen, an denen sie am Morgen sehn können wie ihnen Federn und Blätter gewachsen sind. Und für den Pudel liegt mit ein Gedeck an Fixleins Tisch. Ein Geburtsdorf genügt ihnen. Denn sie halten auch eine Residenzstadt nur "für eine Kollekte von Dorfern," einen Hof für "ein verkleinertes Italien" (*Jubelsenor* 72) ¹ und alles Grosse für "eine grössere Zahl von Kleinigkeiten."

Zu ihnen gehören die guten Frauen: Justine, Thinetten, Drotta. Ihnen gehört der Reiz der Haubenbänder und der Schnupftucher, die kleinen Pfefferkuchen, die Vorfreuden der Hochzeit, der Nachsommer der Ehe und die "600 Krankheiten der Schwangerschaft." Am wichtigsten sind die Mütter. Fibel bleibt noch als Ehemann seiner untertan, "als wurde er garnicht alter." Der Sohn ist für sie, wie für Fixleins Mutter, ein "in Kupfer gestochener Figurant" ihrer Bilderbibel. Ihr Element ist das Kochfeuer und der Fege- wirbel. Im geduldigsten Zuhören über Tod und Ewigkeit können

¹ Zitatsziffern sind aus der leicht zugänglichen Reclamausgabe genommen.

sie wie Siebenkas Lenette sagen: "Zieh morgen den linken Strumpf nicht an, ich muss ihn erst stopfen." Sie sind die derberen Monde im Sonnensystem des Mannes. Aber in ihren kleinen Seelen lebt ein grosser Begriff von den Festtagen. Sie halten darauf, dass es Ostern Kasekuchen gibt und zu Martini eine Gans. Und an diesen Tagen suchen sie draussen auf, was ihre Seele liebt—die Schmetteflinge, Wurzeln, Krauter und die Heimatdorfer.

Diese scheinbar einfache Welt ist aber keine fragmentarische Welt, wie es neben Jean Pauls hohem Menschentum fürs erste scheinen konnte. Ist die hohe Welt, wie A. Meyer nachweist, das "grosse Problem," das Hofisches und Kleinbürgerliches umschliesst, so ist die kleine Welt der Schulmeister und Pfarrherren ein Universum, das die Schatten der hohen Welt in sich begreift. Gutsherrn und Patronatsherrn, Markgrafen und Rektoren und die fürstlichen Feste—Geburtstage, Vokationstage und Hochzeitstage—spielen hinein. Menschen wie Fixlein nehmen vor vornehmen Fenstern im Vorbeigehn den Hut ab, sie schreiben den Namen eines hohen Herrn nie ohne ein H. vorher in ihr Notizbuch ein. Und sie schreiben den Namen Gottes mit bunter Tinte nieder. Dieses "geistige Nestmachen" ist *nicht mehr* Abhängigkeit von der bestimmenden Atmosphäre des Hofischen,² hier beginnt ein eigengesetzliches Lebensgefühl der Kleinen. In diesem bewussten Gefühl der Distanz liegt die erste Beglaubigung und Bejahung des *eigenen Lebensraumes*. Gewiss weder Wuz, noch Fixlein, noch Fibel sind Albanonaturen, die sich mit der Lebenskunst der Humanität auseinandersetzen. Diese sanften und leichten Menschen sind starke Esser und frohliche Trinker. Fixleins Magen war so stark wie sein Herz. Und Fibels Geburtstags-Essen ist eine Schlemmermahlzeit von "Prinzesspastete, Hasenkuchen, Wiener Spiesskrapfen, Galanteriekuchlein und Marzipan." Und der Wein macht sie fromm und weich und lässt "die Harmonikaglocken" im Menschen klingen (*Fixlein* 116, *Jubelsenior* 128). Sie haben eine weibliche Vorliebe für Möbel und Behaglichkeit, sie stehen leicht in Tränen, sie hassen den Tabaksrauch und sie

² Annelies Meyer, *Die hofische Lebensform in der Welt Jean Pauls*, p. 109. "Hier kann nur der Wille und die Treue zum Kleinen dem Leben einen Sinn geben, da das Abgeleitete, Enge, die Abhängigkeit der Verhältnisse ja überall deutlich empfunden wird und immer das Hofische doch das bestimmende Element der Atmosphäre bleibt."

haben leichte Frauenhände. Von jedem Einzelnen von ihnen darf man sagen, was Jean Paul von sich selbst sagte: "Ich bin ein Selbstzunder und ich brauche keine Gehefte um warm und keine Tragodie um weich zu werden"

Hier muss auch der Trennungsstrich gezogen werden zu den Lateinern unter den Schulmeistern. Wenn W. Harich (*Jean Paul*, Leipzig 1925) in seinem Kapitel über die Idylle von einem bewussten Gegensatz Jean Pauls "Zur oberen Schichte der Latinität" spricht und die Schulmeistergestalten und den Lebensstrom der Idyllen darin begründet sehn will, so trifft dies nur für die kleine Gruppe der Falbel, Freudell und Schmelzle zu. Diese frühen Padagogen, die später aus der literarischen Welt Jean Pauls verschwinden, sind die Antipoden unsrer Schulmeister. Das sind die mitleidslosen Knauser des Lebens, die auch die Ehemänner "mit vierschrotigem Herzen und dickstammigen Seelen" sind. Es sind die lacherlichen zerstreuten Philologen die wie Freudell "Herein" sagen, wenn sie ihre Pfeife ausklopfen. Es sind die überheblichen Manner, weil sie am Billardtisch griechisch zählen können, die für Deklinationsfehler am liebsten das Arkebusieren einführen mochten, die ihre Schuler "natürliche Theologie und Vergnügen an der Natur" dozieren, für die eine Reise "Motion mit Geographie" ist und für die der Bauer der Lieferant für Provinzialismen ist. Ihnen fehlt vollkommen der Festtagscharakter der Schulmeister, deren Vokation zugleich ein Jubelsonntag ist.

Die Herrschergrosse unsrer Schulmeister ist ihre Geistigkeit. Sie ist Dorfnähe und Weltferne zugleich, das bedeutet Polhöhe und Poltiefe einer Welt. Ein kindlich arbeitender Abstraktionsdrang hält die rund umher in tausend Spiegelungen zerfallende Welt zusammen. Daraus ergibt sich dieses tragikomische Schopfertum der Kleinen, das die unerreichbare Ferne zum Besitz der Armen macht. Sie stapeln alte Kalender, Bucherverzeichnisse, Dutenpapiere, Journale auf. Alle Sprachen der Welt, deren Vokalismus diese Schulmeister kaum ahnen, werden Ewigkeit in Fibels Alphabeten. Und die Werte, die sie nicht fassen, werden Besitz in Fraktur und Kanzleischrift, in roter, gelber und grüner Tinte. Sie sind anscheinend nur die einfältigen Sammler von errata und die geduldigen Kopisten von Majuscula. Und sie schreiben bedacht-sam in Oktav, Querfolio und Sedez. Das stoffliche Interesse ist fast aufgehoben. Aber in dieser Magie der Buchstaben baut sich

die Wertordnung einer neuen Welt auf. Hier ist der Ordnungssinn des Quintaners, die Sauberkeit der Wohnstube Fixleins, in der Burste, Fliegenklatsche und Kalender am richtigen Fleck hangt, Baufreude des Denkers geworden, der die Gestaltung des Kosmos in Kleinen vornimmt und der in der Schrulle seiner Dorfgeistigkeit die Schöpfungsgeschichte wiederholt. Keine Welt Jean Pauls erlaubt einen fragmentarischen Bestand. Nehmen wir den Tropfen für das Abbild des Weltmeeres und nehmen wir mit dem Helden das Blumenbeet für den Wald, eine Vokation für ein Vollglück, eine Fibel für die magische Offenbarung des Geistigen, ein Regenwolkchen für Tragik und die Welt ist durchlaufen.

Diese Menschen sind weder Klassiker, noch Romantiker, sondern Menschen mit einer "dem Biedermeier verwandten Andacht zu den leisen und unscheinbaren Dingen," wie B. v. Wiese (p. 681) andeutet. Wenn er zugleich hervorhebt, dass Jean Pauls Idylle "eine Gewissheit höchster Daseinsvollendung" aufweist, wie wir sie sonst nur bei Stifter finden, so heisst das entwicklungsgeschichtlich gesprochen. Auftakt zur Biedermeierdichtung. Wenn wir die emotionalen Worte "Kauzigkeiten des deutschen Lebens" und ähnliches bei Seite schieben, so verebbt der Streit um Jean Paul. Seine Idylle ist zweifellos überwältigend Bekenntnisdichtung. Viel von seinem eigenen "geistigen Nestmachen" liegt in ihr. Jean Paul selbst exzerpierte seit seinem 15. Jahre, daher das ungewöhnlich reiche Tatsachen-Material. Er führte ein eigenes Wörterbuch, eine Sammlung von guten und schlechten Namen von Personen, Orten und Titeln, er legte Einfälle, Pläne in Studienheften fest—ein Sammler durch und durch. Und so weit die Idyllen "Bekenntnisdichtung" sind, wie B. v. Wiese sagt, sind sie Ausdruck des *Biedermeier* J. Paul.

Ohne auf die Fragwürdigkeit einer Verallgemeinerung dieses Begriffs *Bekenntnisdichtung* für die ganze deutsche Literatur einzugehen, muss ihm aber innerhalb der Jean Paulschen Dichtung eine strikte Grenze gesetzt werden, soll der Rangstreit zwischen Roman und Idylle schweigen und der Dichter im ehrlichen Lichte seiner geistesgeschichtlichen Bedeutung stehn. In den hohen Romanen, die um ein grosses Menschentum herum gebaut sind, steckt—trotz Wiese *Erkenntnisdichtung*. Und Erkenntnis ist zeitgebunden. Der Hof war eine milieubildende Kraft des 18. Jahrhunderts. Und Spiegelungen hofischer Machtfragen in der

burgerlichen Welt sind soziologisch gesehn der natürlliche Abglanz der hofischen Herrschaftsschicht. In diesen Romanen haben daher auch die alten Elemente des Bundesromanes Raum, die Hamletschen Melancholien, die Toleranz und Erziehungstraume und die Sternesche Satire. Der Mensch des 18. Jahrhunderts muss seine menschliche Substanz in Auseinandersetzung mit einer bestimmten hofischen Form behaupten. Er muss vor ihr und trotz ihr bestehn. Und erst über diese hohen Menschen hinaus konnte Jean Paul zu den Formen burgerlicher Wirklichkeit gelangen. Hier geht es nicht um Weite und Enge, sondern um *den Umbruch der sozial tragenden Schicht*.

In Albano, Gustav, Flamin, Ottomar, Gaspard liegt die Abrechnung mit dem Bildungsgut, das Jean Paul in sich selbst noch zu bewaltigen hatte. Und in den Lateinern Falbel, Freudell, Klagibell setzt sich die Abrechnungslinie bis ins Kleine fort. Sie sind ein idyllischer Exkurs zu den hohen Romanen des absolutistischen 18. Jahrhunderts. Die vorerst feindlichen Problemkreise standischer Werte und der Personlichkeitswerte müssen mit *Erkenntnis* durchschritten sein, ehe die Idylle das *Bekenntnis* zur burgerlichen Personlichkeitsgestaltung des biedermeierlichen Schulmeisters ablegen konnte. Und damit erhält Jean Paul geistesgeschichtlich seinen Platz am Schnittpunkt zweier Kulturen, an dem der Kavalier des 18. Jahrhunderts abdankt und der neue preussische Bürger in den Vordergrund tritt, für den Friedrich Wilhelm III. 1803/10 die Orden "für burgerliche Tugenden" gestiftet hatte.

MARIANNE THALMANN

Wellesley College

CHAUCER AND AULUS GELLIUS

In the form most familiar to students of Chaucer, Deschamps' famous ballade addressed to the English poet opens as follows:¹

O Socrates plains de philosophie,
Seneque en meurs et Anglax en pratique,
Ovides grans en ta poeterie,
Bries en parler, saiges en rethorique.

In the interpretation of these lines uncertainty has always been

¹ W. W. Skeat, *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, I, Oxford, 1899, pp. lvi-lvii.

felt concerning the meaning of the passage *et Anglux en pratique*, and especially of the word *Anglux*. There can be no doubt that in the unique manuscript this word reads either *anglux* or *auglux*.² Virtually all the editors adopt the reading *anglux*, and they commonly capitalize the word as a proper name.³ Toynbee translates the passage, "and English in practice," and Lounsbury renders it, "and English in conduct of life."⁴

In the most complete commentary that has yet been written upon Deschamps' poem, the late Professor Jenkins emended the unintelligible *et Anglux* of the second line to *Auglius*, and interpreted it as meaning Aulus Gellius.⁵ The expression *Auglius en pratique* Jenkins translates, "an Aulus Gellius in practical affairs," and adds the following trenchant comment:⁶

Auglius (MS *anglux*) I take to be Aulus Gellius Deschamps used the *Polycraticus*, and the name appears there (Webb's excellent edition II, p. 99, 23) as Agellius, and it was so generally spelled until corrected by Lambeck († 1680). "Quelquesuns," says the old *Dictionnaire de Trévoux*, "le nomment Agellius, d'autres Augellius." From St Augustine's sanction "Vir elegantissimi eloqui et multae ac facundae scientiae," down to Boccaccio's "noble historiar," Gellius, more popular than Quintilian, en-

² A photograph of the pages containing Deschamps' ballade in the unique manuscript (Paris, Bibl. Nat., Fonds français, MS 840, fol. 62r-62v) is given by Caroline F. E. Spurgeon, *Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion, 1357-1900*, III, Cambridge, 1925, Appendix B, facing p. 16.

³ The standard edition is that of [A. H. E.] Queux de Saint-Hilaire, *Œuvres complètes de Eustache Deschamps (Sociétés des anciens Textes français)*, 11 vols., Paris, 1878-1903. Notes are contributed by G. Raynaud in vols. X and XI. For the ballade to Chaucer see II, 138; *Collection des Poètes champenois: Œuvres inédites d'Eustache Deschamps* [ed. P. Tarbé], I, Paris, 1849, p. 123, E.-G. Sandras, *Étude sur G. Chaucer*, Paris, 1859, p. 261; P. Toynbee, *The Ballade addressed by Eustache Deschamps to Geoffrey Chaucer*, in *The Academy* XL (1891), 432-3, P. Toynbee, *Specimens of Old French*, Oxford, 1892, pp. 314-5. The reading *et angles en pratique* (see T. Wright, *Anecdota Literaria*, London, 1844, p. 13) must be regarded as careless.

⁴ See Toynbee, in *The Academy*, XL (1891), 432; T. R. Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer*, III, New York, 1892, p. 14.

⁵ T. A. Jenkins, *Deschamps' Ballade to Chaucer*, in *Modern Language Notes*, XXXIII (1918), 268-78. Earlier printings of this ballade, and comments upon it, are listed by Jenkins, p. 268. On p. 271 he suggests that *et anglux* might be emended to *et Auglius*, still meaning Aulus Gellius.

⁶ Jenkins, p. 271.

joyed a high reputation a double reputation, in fact, for he was eminent both in letters and in the world of affairs as a judge. Even juriconsults have drawn upon Gellius in matters of law: so Dirksen, *Hinterlassene Schriften*, I, 21. Chaucer, in Deschamps' mind, is eminent not only in letters, but also in "practice," as one may speak in these days of the practice of a lawyer, or of a physician. Flanked as he is here by Seneca and Ovid, Gellius, it seems to me, has much better claims than the obscure and unpublished Angelus of Rome suggested by Raynaud (xi, 204).⁷

Probably few will deny that Professor Jenkins has revealed a reasonable possibility, and presumably his suggestion that in the passage before us Deschamps meant to name Aulus Gellius has already been welcomed generally as the most acceptable explanation at hand. In supporting his argument by a parallel between Gellius and Chaucer as men of practical affairs, however, Professor Jenkins seems to me to have overlooked more obvious and persuasive evidence. During the Middle Ages most persons who knew of Aulus Gellius at all must have formed their acquaintanceship through his one work of wide appeal, the entertaining *Noctes Atticae*, in which he is revealed not as a lawyer or man of practical affairs, but as a reader of old books and a collector and recorder of curious information found in them. I suggest, therefore, that if Deschamps was addressing Chaucer as "Aulus Gellius en pratique" he had in mind not so much the *practical occupations* of the two men as their *literary habits*. Concerning these habits both writers are delightfully communicative. In the preface to his *Noctes Atticae* Gellius discloses his literary predilections with engaging candor:⁸

For whenever I had taken in hand any Greek or Latin book, or had heard anything worth remembering, I used to jot down whatever took my fancy, of any and every kind, without any definite plan or order; and such notes I would lay away as an aid to my memory, like a kind of literary store-house . . . And since, as I have said, I began to amuse myself by assembling these notes during the long winter nights which I spent on a

⁷ G. Raynaud's suggestion is found in the standard *Oeuvres complètes d'Eustache Deschamps*, ed. Queux de Saint-Hilaire, xi, 204. "Angres (*lisez Ange*) de Rome, dont le nom figure dans un catalogue des livres de Dunois publié par Leroux de Lincy, et dont quelques lettres se trouvent dans un manuscrit de la Bibliothèque nationale." Apparently nothing reassuring has been discovered concerning Raynaud's "Angres (*lisez Ange*) de Rome."

⁸ *The Attic Nights of Aulus Gellius*, with an English translation by John C. Rolfe, I, London, etc., 1927, pp. xxvii, xxxv, xxxvii.

country-place in the land of Attica, I have therefore given them the title of *Attic Nights*. . . . For those, however, who have never found pleasure nor busied themselves in reading, inquiring, writing and taking notes, who have never spent wakeful nights in such employments, who have never improved themselves by discussion and debate with rival followers of the same Muse, but are absorbed in the turmoil of business affairs—for such men it will be by far the best plan to hold wholly aloof from these “Nights” . . . As much longer life as the Gods’ will shall grant me, and as much respite as is given me from managing my affairs and attending to the education of my children, every moment of that remaining and leisure time I shall devote to collecting similar brief and entertaining memoranda.

A sympathetic reader of Chaucer hardly needs to be reminded of the resemblance in temper between this agreeable *apologia* of Gellius and the engaging confessions of the English poet:

Thanne mote we to bokes that we fynde,
 Thourgh whiche that olde thynges ben in mynde,
 And to the doctryne of these olde wyse
 Yeven credence, in every skylful wyse,
 And trowen on these olde aproved storyes
 Of holynesse, of regnes, of victoryes,
 Of love, of hate, of othere sondry thynges,
 Of whiche I may nat make rehersynges.
 And if that olde bokes weren aweye,
 Yloren were of remembraunce the keye.

On bokes for to rede I me delyte,
 And in myn herte have hem in reverence,
 And to hem yeve swich lust and swich credence
 That there is wel unethe game non
 That fro my bokes make me to gon.⁹
 Of usage—what for lust and what for lore—
 On bokes rede I ofte, as I yow tolde.

For out of olde feldes, as men seyth,
 Cometh al this newe corn from yer to yere,
 And out of olde bokes, in good feyth,
 Cometh al this newe science that men lere¹⁰

In view of the fact that both writers declared themselves to the world as literary antiquarians, and that in their writings both

⁹ *Legend of Good Women*, Prologue G, ll. 17-26, 30-4.

¹⁰ *Parliament of Fowls*, ll. 15-6, 22-5. See also *House of Fame*, ll. 647-57.

drew with unremitting ardor from "olde bokes," I venture the proposal that Deschamps' expression be interpreted not as "an Aulus Gellius in practical affairs," but as "an Aulus Gellius in his literary habits."

KARL YOUNG

Yale University

AN UNUSUAL MEANING OF "MAKE" IN CHAUCER

The following lines from Chaucer's *Troilus and Cressida* (c. 1386) present a problem in translation:

1786 Go, litel bok, go, litel myn tragedye,
 Ther God thi makere yet, er that he dye,
 1788 So sende myght to make in som comedye.¹

However, if *make* is interpreted to mean 'match' the lines are no longer obscure. This meaning is given in the *NED*: "Make, *v.*² *Obs.* Also 6 *Sc.* mak. [f. Make sb.¹] *trans.* and *intr.* To mate, pair, match" Apparently overlooking Chaucer's early use of *make* in this sense, the editors of the *NED* give the following passage as the earliest example: "1463 *Bury Wills* (Camden) 23, I wille she haue . . . my flat pece enchased to make with a salt saler of sylver."

An analysis of the three lines from the *Troilus* affords evidence to permit the translation of *make* as 'match.' *Go* may be interpreted as 'go your way,' with no destination in view. This fits Professor Tatlock's explanation: "In Chaucer the 'go' is a mere farewell, without telling the book where to go."²

The word *ther* is more obscure. There is no meaning in the *NED* which entirely fits the case. However, one note is helpful (p. 281, note 5): ". . . Formerly sometimes referring to what immediately precedes or follows. . . ." In other words, *there* may serve simply as a link between two parts of a sentence. If this is the case, *ther* need not be translated, or, at any rate, may mean nothing more than 'then.'

The *NED* gives the following meaning for *yet* (p. 48, note 3c):

¹ Ed. F. N. Robinson, p. 563 Other references to Chaucer's poetry in this paper are also to Professor Robinson's edition

² J. S. P. Tatlock, "The Epilog of Chaucer's *Troilus*," *MP*, XVIII (1921), 630 n

"With *ere*, *before*, etc. indicating the ultimate occurrence of something after an interval of time" *Yet*, then, may be translated as 'eventually,' or in this case may be omitted.

The subjunctive *sende* is a key word in the passage. "May God send . . .," points to a way out of the obscurity in these lines. The subjunctive also throws some light on the word *ther*. On several occasions Chaucer uses *there* with the subjunctive. In *The Friar's Tale* there is an example:

1561 "Heyt' now," quod he, "ther Jhesu Crist yow blesse . . ."

In *The Merchant's Tale*:

1307 This sentence, and a hundred thynges worse,
1308 Writeth this man, ther God his bones corse.

Also in the *Troilus*, III:

965 ". . . Kneleth now, while that yow leste,
966 There God youre hertes brynge soone at reste!"

In these passages, and in the one under discussion, *there* is used with the subjunctive in oaths or prayers. *There* seems to point to a subjunctive which follows. It is apparent that *there* need not be translated in such a case, a conclusion which we have reached earlier by means of the *NED*.

In is explained by the *NED* (p. 126, note 13): "Of means or instrumentality: now usually expressed by *with*." It gives as an example of this meaning: "1580 Lyly *Euphues* (Arb.) 445 It more delighteth them to talke of Robin hood then to shoot in his bowe."

Comedye is to be taken in its medieval sense, a narrative with a happy ending.³ Such a conception of comedy makes it impossible to interpret the passage as being a reference to *The Legend of Good Women*. Professor Root discusses the possibility of *comedye* being an allusion to *The Canterbury Tales*.⁴

Taking the lines as a whole we are able to translate the passage as follows:

Go your way, little book, go my little tragedy,
Then may God send enough power
To your author, before he dies,
To match [you, the tragedy] with a comedy.

³ For a discussion of this meaning of comedy see the *NED*, which, as an example, quotes this line from the *Troilus*

⁴ R. K. Root, *Troilus and Criseyde* . . . (Princeton, 1926), p. 558.

This interpretation fits the idea contained in the epilogue. Chaucer has apologized (lines 1772-5) to his feminine readers for making Cressida untrue to Troilus. So it is not surprising that he should express the wish to write in the future something with a more pleasant ending, which will match the tragedy of *Troilus and Cressida*.

RICHARD C. BOYS

Baltimore, Md

"REAVING THE DEAD" IN THE AGE OF CHIVALRY

In the *Faerie Queene*, II: 8, 15, the henchmen of Archimago undertake to despoil the sleeping Guyon of his armor and war-gear, Pyrochles declaring, "I will him reave of armes, the victors hire." In the next stanza the Palmer remonstrates, "To spoile the dead of weed is sacrilege, and doth all sins exceed." Commenting on the first passage, Professor Winstanley remarks:

In the *Iliad* the armour of a knight was quite lawfully the spoil of the victor, but the custom of chivalry was different, since it was considered disgraceful to rob the dead. In Malory's *Mort d'Arthure* he mentions, as the last act of desolation, that the 'robbers and pillers' come upon the field to 'rob and pill' the noble knights who were slain¹

There are examples of stripping and spoiling in abundance in the heroic age. Hector divests Patroclus and Merion² of their war-gear; Ajax takes the armor from the slain Simoiszus. In *Beowulf* much spoiling of this sort takes place: Ongendēow is pillaged by his slayer, Eofof; Eānmund by Wēohstān; and Hygelāc is stripped by his enemies, the Frisians. The borders of the Bayeux Tapestry show that this was an accepted practice in the eleventh century. The romance-writers everywhere recognize it. In all the Percival stories the young hero robs his fallen enemy, the Red Knight, of his armor, and a member of the Round Table, usually Gawain, assists him, not only in removing the vestments of the dead but also in clothing the unsophisticated youngster in them.

¹ Lilian Winstanley—*Faerie Queene*, Book II (Cambridge, 1914), p. 265.

² This is not the fate of Merion in Homer, but in Dares Phrygius (*De Excidio Trojæ Historia*, section 19).

But aside from the romances, evidence is at hand to prove that despoiling and pillaging were respectable practices among the military gentry. In Gilbert the Haye's (fl. 1456) translation of the *Arbre des Batailles* of Honore Bonet, entitled the *Buke of the Law of Armys*,³ the rule is plainly stated, "as of gudis wonnyn apon nymyes, bot any questhoun, ar thairis that wynnys thame" That the Scotch took this to mean despoiling of the dead is indicated by the description of the devastation at Bannockburn in Barbour's Bruce:⁴

and quhen þai nakit spulget war
þat war slayne in þe battale þar,
It wes, forsuth, a great ferly
Til se sammyn so feill dede ly.

Further references to the practice are to be found in Holinshed. The Earl of Warwick is killed by one of King Edward's men, who "spoiled him to the naked skin," and the Duke of Exeter meets with a similar fate on Barnett Field. At Agincourt the English soldiers are described as having to rest after taking "the spoile of such as were slaine." A general pillaging approved by army leaders occurs after St. Albans (1455); soldiers are described as having "applied the spoile . . . not onelie stripping those that had borne armor against them, but also the townsmen and other, with whom they might meet." As late as the sixteenth century a party of English soldiers lingering too long "for pillage" were set upon by the French and slain. Nowhere do we find the chronicler mentioning this despoiling and pillaging as being under condemnation.

It is frequently objected that this robbery was the work of camp-followers and criminals, but references like the following (in which the word *Englishmen* means English soldiery) show that such classes took only what the knights had left.

Pezants spoiled the carcasses of all such things as the Englishmen had left; who took nothing but gold and silver, jewels, rich apparell, and costlie armour. But the plowmen and pezants left nothing behind, neither shirt nor clout.⁵

³ Scottish Text Society, vol. 44, p. 154.

⁴ Scottish Text Society, vol. 21, line 459 *et seqq.*

⁵ The Holinshed references are from volume 3 of the *Chronicles* (London, 1808). In the order in which the excerpts appear the page-references are 314. 314. 82. 241. 586. 82.

It appears, then, that it was entirely consistent with chivalric standards for a knight to divest a fallen enemy not only of his weapons, but also of his armor, and that wholesale pillaging by the soldiery was a practice approved by army leaders.

ESTON EVERETT ERICSON

The University of North Carolina

REVIEWS

German Literature of the Mid-Nineteenth Century in England and America as Reflected in the Journals 1840-1914. By LILLIE V. HATHAWAY. Boston Chapman & Grimes, 1935. 341 pp.

This attractively printed volume is made up as follows: Preface, one page, Introduction, pp. 7-12; Lyric Poetry, pp. 15-32; Drama, pp. 33-58; The Novel and the Short Story, pp. 59-123; Conclusion, pp. 125-131, Chronological Lists of References to English Periodicals, pp. 133-234, American Periodicals, pp. 235-309; Index of German Authors, pp. 311-329; Lists of Periodicals, pp. 331-334; General Bibliography, pp. 335-337; Index (giving names of authors discussed in the introduction), pp. 339-341.

As indicated by the title and the table of contents, Miss Hathaway has undertaken to ascertain, from a study of some 42 British and 72 American periodicals (more of the latter being taken because so many of them were short-lived), the attitude in Great Britain and the United States toward those German writers whose major works, or a considerable number of them, appeared in print from about the late thirties to the eighties of the nineteenth century. Her reason for choosing this particular period is "more especially to focus attention upon a period of German literature which has but recently received proper appreciation both at home and abroad." The writers thus involved total 170 and include a number born in the late decades of the eighteenth century—*e. g.* Leopold Schefer, born 1784, and Furst Puckler-Muskau, born 1785—as well as some born as late as 1850, *e. g.* "W. Heimbürg." In view of this distribution of her dates, I should be inclined to question the omission of Uhland (1787-1862) and Ruckert (1788-1866), both of whom published a number of works within the period covered by the study; nor am I sure that it was wise to omit so important a figure as Heine, just because he has been treated elsewhere.

Technically Miss Hathaway's study is an admirable piece of work, and her general method might well serve as a model for any similar investigation. The detailed references drawn from the periodicals, which number 1312 for English and 928 for American journals, and which are in themselves quite informative (for example, in many cases Miss Hathaway has inserted the title of the German original of a translated work), are grouped, interpreted, and to some extent excerpted in the interesting and well-written introductory essay. Indexes facilitate the quick location of any given author's name in both references and introduction, and graphs give a vivid picture of the fluctuations of interest in German literature in both countries, so far as the number and importance of the journalistic references to it permit us to draw such conclusions. That such reasoning is not unjustified becomes evident when we note that the peaks in Miss Hathaway's graphs, showing high points in the years 1847-52 and 1867-78, are roughly parallel to those shown on the chart in my own bibliography. Evidently certain social and literary forces were at work during those periods which stimulated both the publication of translations from the German and the directing of critical attention to German literature. Broadly speaking, the two countries are alike in this respect, which tends to strengthen the above conclusion; it is however noteworthy that the total number of British references exceeds the American total until the late eighties, after which, though both countries show a rapid decline in such items, America holds a moderate lead until the end of the chosen period. If only articles of some importance are taken—as Miss Hathaway does in her Chart B—the relation shifts slightly; on this chart America forges ahead in 1866, outstrips Britain very notably for some four years, but is then decisively beaten from 1875 on; the British line does not again drop below the American one until about 1894, after which, to be sure, America remains ahead to the end, showing a marked spurt of interest from about 1903 to 1908. When the war broke out in 1914, the American line was already falling sharply, and it may be assumed that it approached zero in the following years.

The question as to what is "literature" is not purely academic when it comes to a study like this, but is bound to determine the lines of inclusion and exclusion; I struggled with the problem in making my own bibliography, and ultimately found that I could not restrict myself merely to the three standard categories which determine the three sections of Miss Hathaway's introduction. As a matter of fact, she does not quite keep within this limitation either, including in the chapter on the novel books of travel. It would be interesting to know whether some other types of writing that are, so to speak, tangent to imaginative literature would have affected the final result if they had been included. I think of such

genres as biography, general history, art history and appreciation, essays and popular philosophy, correspondence, and the like.

Within the self-imposed limits of Miss Hathaway's study, one is impressed, as she herself is, by the relatively disproportionate attention paid to mediocre writers, some of whom (*e. g.* Louise Muhlbach) are virtually unknown in Germany, while novelists like Gerstacker, Hacklander, Hahn-Hahn, Marlitt, Werner, Heimbürg, Ebers, and others, once popular, are now little regarded in Germany. And on the other hand, one notes with regret the neglect of such men of genius as Hebbel, Grillparzer, Ludwig, Meyer, Storm, and Anzengruber, recognizing however, as Miss Hathaway points out, that in some cases they were no less ignored at home than abroad.

Miss Hathaway's study, which constitutes a significant addition to the series of doctoral dissertations and other investigations dealing with Anglo-German literary relations produced at Wisconsin under the direction of A. R. Hohlfeld or by those who have worked with him, whets one's appetite for more of the same type of thing, and leads one to hope that the various similar studies now under way may soon become available in print. A great deal of spadework has already been done in this field, and it would be an admirable thing if all the rough cultivation could soon be finished, so that Professor Hohlfeld might undertake the landscaping—to continue the figure—that no other hand is so competent to carry to completion.

BAYARD Q. MORGAN

Stanford University

Deutsche Literatur. Sammlung literarischer Kunst- und Kulturdenkmäler in Entwicklungsreihen. Reihe "Politische Dichtung." Leipzig: Ph. Reclam. (1) Vol. 8. *Deutsche Dichtung im Weltkrieg 1914-1918.* Edited by Dr. ERNST VOLKMANN. (2) Vol. 2. *Fremdherrschaft und Befreiung 1795-1815.* Edited by Dr. ROBERT F. ARNOLD. (3) Vol. 7. *Im Neuen Reich 1871-1914.* Edited by Dr. HELENE ADOLF.

The anthology *Deutsche Dichtung im Weltkrieg* is intended to demonstrate *welche Züge im Bilde des Weltkrieges . . . den Deutschen im Dritten Reich wesentlich erschienen sind.* Accordingly, we are dealing not with a collection compiled along scientific lines, but with a book of devotion, characterized by a certain *Weltanschauung*. Its final and highest ideal is—to express it in the words of the editor Volkmann—*der heldisch geschaute Tatmenschen*.

Consequently, the entire emphasis, in the introduction as well as

in the selection of the poems, is placed on the initial period of the war. The emotional surge, the communal spirit, the general re-orientation in the service of the war, are presented in great detail. The sympathy of the editor ceases, however, where the development in the second part of the war is concerned. *Von den kriegsbejahenden Dichtern haben die wenigsten durchgehalten bis ans Ende*, is the reproachful criticism. Volkmann directs his passionate and vindictive polemics against those who 'changed their views'—that is what he calls the growing consciousness of the senselessness of the war—and above all against those who became active opponents of the war. They are for him foreign Jewish traitors, and their change of attitude is due to a cowardly fear of military service, to a psychopathic nervous weakness. This is the characterization given in the introduction, but this whole group of poets is not represented in the selection of poems. (*Es ware*) *heute nicht angebracht, auch die Gruppe der Kriegsgegner . . . zu Worte kommen zu lassen*. All the combatants and all the war-dead are enlisted on the side of the nationalistic martial spirit. Even where it must be admitted that the men at the front felt a solidarity across the trench lines, this concession is immediately modified by the assertion that it had nothing to do with the international fraternization of the proletariat. The fact that the war was the first occasion in modern times when the poems of workers spoke to the whole German people, is not brought out in proportion to its importance. Had the work of these poets represented not been restricted to a minimum, the human element, the cry of horror at the war, of longing for peace, would have drowned out the heroic motif. While the human truth of German suffering is silenced or slandered, for the sake of a heroic idealization, the opportunity is missed to emphasize the factors that united all the nations in the crushing experience of the war, instead of those dividing them.

A truer impression, by far, of the poetic formulation given to the national experience of the war years, than can be gained from Mr. Volkmann's biased anthology, would result from the examination of the complete edition of any poet of the time, such as, for example, the student Walter Hoerich, who fell at the age of twenty-one. Here, too, can be found the heroic enthusiasm, the fiery courage of the beginning. But here is the expression, as well, of the profound ordeal of the war-weary man. As early as the autumn of 1915, he wrote his *Abschied* on the occasion of a furlough, which contains the deeply human lines:

*O Vaterland, du bietest leuchtenden Ruhm—
Aber was soll einem Leichnam die Krone von Heldentum?
Und wer nur eines Tages Sonne getrunken hat,
Der schaudert, sinnlos zu sterben wie ein verwehtes Blatt.*

Such words come from the depths of a people steeped in suffering and need, and are hardly expressions of cowardice and "back-

sliding." What thousands among the fighting men of all the nations who were not blinded by undue exaltation felt, is expressed in this poem by words such as:

*Aber ich will nicht wagen Gewinn und Verlust,
Ich will eine Stimme bekennen, die in mir redet: Du musst.*

For this poet and hero, also one of those who fell, Volkmann had no space, although many pages are filled with poor and unknown poems of men who came to prominence in the present government.

Thus the anthology does not give an adequate picture of war-poetry. It is extremely unfortunate that it belongs to a collection destined to represent German literature for a long time to come and intended to supersede *Kurschner's Nationalliteratur*. The situation is particularly deplorable, since it is only natural that the literary products of those years of combat are, even today, hardly known outside of Germany.

The volume *Fremdherrschaft und Befreiung, 1795-1815*, edited by F. Arnold, former general editor of this series, shows, on the contrary, what a representative collection like this one should be. A short and clear introduction characterizes the time and its problems, the connections between history and poetry. Various remarks of the introduction as well as many less known poems or passages in prose which he selected, suggest a lively flow of moods and reactions, behind the conventional picture of the period in question. The material is divided in four chapters: *Reichsuntergang—Rheinbündische Zeit—Erhebung—Befreiung*.

It is, perhaps, not strange that the volume *Im Neuen Reich, 1871-1914*, edited by Helene Adolf, does not give the same impression of clarity and completeness. One reason for this, certainly, is the character of this particular period, a second reason, undoubtedly, is the fact that this period is still too near to be elucidated by research—a convincing illustration of what Thomas Mann in the *Zauberberg* has said about the *märchenhaften Vergangenheitscharakter* of the pre-war time. Even granted this, we cannot help feeling that the editor in her introduction should have contributed something new to her subject. Instead, she indulges in today's baroque fashion of literary criticism: to make use of disparate points of views or methods of interpretation, beclouding incongruities by a flowery diction. When the attempt is made at an interpretation of a period, what is the meaning of such statements as *Die wirtschaftliche Lage bildet halb Erklärung, halb Fohe der kulturellen Entwicklung*. Or: *So finden sich Imperialismus und Einsicht in die Lage, obwohl ihren Forderungen nach entgegengesetzt, doch oft im selben Dichter vereinigt, weil sie derselben Wurzel, der Vaterlandsliebe, entsprossen sind . . . Schliesslich war die den Dichtern anvertraute Botschaft, wie an das Nacheinander der Kunststrichtungen so an das Nebeneinander der Parteien aufgeteilt*. Such

sentences, and these are not the only ones, indicate a fundamental lack in clarity of vision. After this introduction, the reader does not feel like trusting the documentary value of the selected poems, although the volume certainly contains valuable and interesting material. It is arranged in five chapters *Kulturbkampf und Granderjahre—Soziale und nationale Note—Die neuen Richtungen, der neue Herr—Weltpolitik und Innerlichkeit—Abrechnung und Vorgefühl.*

WM. R. GAEDE

Brooklyn College

Lessing's Relation to the English Language and Literature. By

CURTIS C. D. VAIL. New York: Columbia University Press, 1936. Pp. vi + 220. \$3.00.

Mr. Vail's purpose is "to investigate so far as the sources permit the steps by which Lessing obtained a mastery over English and to measure the degree of his knowledge, and to examine the infiltration of English material into his critical ideas and its effect on his dramatic production" (4). Two Parts, devoted respectively to language and literature, are followed by a Conclusion: "The Profile of Lessing's English Interest." A bibliography and an adequate index complete the well-printed volume.

The "method of procedure" is for each Part chronological; but in Part II chapters on criticism and on composition alternate, with consequent overlapping and some confusion as to dates and "periods." From the evidence, neither progressive "mastery" nor variable "infiltration" can be precisely determined for successive years. It is plain, however, that mid-way in the 'fifties Lessing had acquired an intimate acquaintance with the English language and considerable knowledge of English literature—an ampler knowledge certainly than extant notes or manifest "borrowings" now reveal. His recorded judgments of English works, being occasional, have to be evaluated according to the circumstances of the pronouncement, the dominant interest at the moment, and such right to self-reliance as information, experience, and maturity can give. Though Mr. Vail is mindful of these considerations and, when speaking of England, does not forget France, he appears not always to realize that at every utterance on a subject, Lessing was no more bound than Matthew Arnold to speak his full mind.

Part I, then, shows Lessing making progress. His earliest translations are good; the later ones are justly appraised as excellent, albeit often in extravagant terms. *Ein Herr hatte einen Schosshund, dem er sehr gewogen war* is hardly an "eloquent circumlocution" (58) for "A gentleman had a favourite spaniel." The principal value of this Part attaches to the numerous ex-

amples, often arranged in parallel columns. It was worth the time and trouble to make this demonstration.

Part II, equally comprehensive, fully documented, and in most matters accurate, is better for the presentation than the interpretation of evidence. Demonstration here is harder, the calculation of probabilities less certain, the point to be proved more elusive, and it is sometimes difficult to see the forest for the trees. Not only is there in Mr. Vail's treatment a disturbing lack of verbal precision and some mixing of metaphors—he allows himself in translating Lessing sundry short cuts and approximations which are particularly unfortunate. For example: "the French don't care to read any prose tragedies at all." Lessing adds vaguely enough: "For myself I cannot give any similar reason as valid but have to be content with giving the tragedy from the French abstract or not at all." His statement is, perhaps intentionally, so obscure" etc. (123) What Lessing wrote was . . . *weil die Franzosen keine prosaische Trauerspiele lesen mogen. Ich kann keine ähnliche Ursache für mich geltend machen, sondern muss mich lediglich mit der Notwendigkeit entschuldigen, meinen Lesern eine so angenehme Neuigkeit entweder gar nicht, oder durch die Vermittlung des französischen Übersetzers mitzuteilen*—this is neither vague nor obscure. We wonder what sort of literary craftsman Mr. Vail conceives Lessing to have been. Lessing is "an essentially creative personality" (203), yet there are "materials and patterns from other literatures which played their part in shaping the laboratory processes of his genius" (6). "The fragment [of *Alcibiades*] cannot give us any insight into Lessing's practice in tragedy at this time. . . . It is interesting, however, in that we may observe in it the poet in his workshop at this period. The numerous sources serve merely as the mortar with which he covered his own inner structural framework, his original idea. It is a necessary conclusion that the mortar must take the shape of the framework. . . . *Minna* . . . seems to have been constructed in a similar manner" (159).

Mr. Vail sees Lessing enter, with *Emilia Galotti*, "the realm of the classic tragedy, and, leaning on an English model, he attains a simplicity that is not French, but Greek" (186). Similarly, Lessing declared that it is *gewiss, dass auch Thomson nicht allein, wie ich es nennen mochte, französisch, sondern griechisch regelmässig ist . . . Seine "Sophonisbe" ist von einer Simplizität, mit der sich selten, oder nie, ein französischer Dichter begnugt hat*. I suspect there is more in A. M. Wagner's diagnosis of this *grosse Erlebnis Lessings*—which Mr. Vail finds "scarcely tenable" (142)—than in what Mr. Vail now tells us. "What in the last analysis is Lessing's entire critical reform, or the methodology of Rationalism in general for that matter, but a progression from one authority to another in the quest of an absolute authority!" (115).

Well, "we discover that he found [ca. 1760] the beginnings of a new methodology, not in a foreign pattern, but in the metaphysical idea that we derive our rules from the works of nature" (209). In the *Dramaturgie* "it is always Shakespeare, however, the genius, to whom Lessing turns as a textbook, drawn from nature, on the drama and even on acting" (180).

Mr. Vail set himself a formidable task, prosecuted it diligently, and attained one of his objects. The other was perhaps essentially unattainable. Yet in Part II there are useful observations, obscured though they are by verbiage.

Harvard University

W. G. HOWARD

Kleist's Werke. Zweite Auflage. Nach der von Georg Schmidt, Reinhold Steig und Georg Minde-Pouet besorgten Ausgabe neu durchgesehen und erweitert von GEORG MINDE-POUET. Vols. I-II Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut. [1936]. Pp. 312 and 317.

Of the new eight-volume edition of Heinrich von Kleist's works, prepared by Professor Georg Minde-Pouet, the first two volumes have appeared. These contain a critical biography, an introduction to the letters and the letters.

The biography, based on the first edition of 1904-1905, has been amplified and corrected with due consideration of the contents of new letters and the large amount of research on Kleist during the interim. Some of the changes consist in the addition of the given names of numerous personages, the correction of official titles, the modification of diction in the interest of greater objectivity or added precision, the correction of dates, and slight emendations. Cognizance has been taken of the dispute over the date of Kleist's birth, the staging of *Die Familie Schroffenstein* during the author's lifetime, various efforts to secure his liberation from imprisonment at Chalons-sur-Marne, the presentation of the first number of his journal *Phobus* to the Emperor of Austria, his activity in Austria in 1809, new details about his death, the gradual growth of interest in his works, and his significance for the Germany of to-day. Minde-Pouet has written with admirable restraint, directness and clarity. Within the limits of sixty pages he has given a sound critical evaluation of Kleist and a succinct, factual biography free from the sensational rumor-mongering which has marred much of the writing on the author's life and character.

The introduction to Kleist's letters has likewise been modified. Explanations, which were given as footnotes in the first edition, are to be included in the eighth volume with all notes and variants. The result is a handsomer type page, but it will entail the

handling of an additional volume. Moreover, the annotations will not be available until the last volume appears. A single index of names of places and of persons replaces the former separate indexes. The revised number of letters is 220 as compared with 195 in the first edition.

Some letters have been re-dated, errors in the designation of recipients have been corrected, hitherto unknown addressees have been discovered, the four autographs and the eccentric letter to Adolphe Henriette Vogel have been omitted, and numerous excellent photographic illustrations have been added. A new letter (II, 41) establishes the correct date of Kleist's arrival in Paris as July 3, 1801. Important re-arrangements and additions are to be found in the later letters to Marie von Kleist. A number of the new letters are to Adolphe von Werdeck, Karl Freiherr von Stein zum Altenstein, Iffland, Eduard Prinz von Lichnowsky, Karl August Freiherr von Hardenberg, Wilhelm Prinz von Preussen and Ulrike von Kleist.

Several additional letters to Karl Freiherr von Stein zum Altenstein give further evidence of the minister's helpfulness to Kleist in the matter of a civil appointment, and reveal the freedom with which the latter disclosed his ill-health, despondence, diffidence, incapacity for sustained effort, and lack of self-confidence to his kindly, distinguished superior. A letter of July 28 and 29, 1801, to Adolphe von Werdeck is valuable in part because of the frank characterization of Ulrike which is given in greater detail than previously. Another letter of November 29, 1801, to the same friend reveals Kleist's heightened interest in paintings, and refers to the conflict in art between reason and creative imagination. Kleist's tendency to repeat passages in several letters is again in evidence. A communication of January 1, 1809, to Freiherr von Stein zum Altenstein is significant because it contains an estimate and a recommendation of Kleist's associate Adam Muller. His difficulties with narrow censorship in the editing of the *Berliner Abendblätter* and the chicanery of Chancellor von Hardenberg are reviewed with added details in an important letter to Prince William of Prussia whom he asked for intervention.

The proof-reading has been done with the meticulous thoroughness so characteristic of Professor Minde-Pouet. Strange to say, however, the title-pages of both volumes list Georg Schmidt rather than Erich Schmidt as one of the editors of the first edition. One letter (I, 91) bears the signature K. H. instead of the frequent H. K.

This new edition adds much more detailed information than can be summarized in a brief review; it includes important corrections, and renders available numerous letters, some of which had been printed in publications which are not readily accessible. It is an achievement based on long, arduous, careful research by Professor Minde-Pouet.

JOHN C. BLANKENAGEL

Wesleyan University

Goethe in Umwelt und Folgezeit Gesammelte Studien. Von Dr. MARTIN SOMMERFELD. Leiden: A. W. Sijthoff's Uitgeversmaatschappij N. V. 1935. 281 pp. Fl. 5.—

Die vom Verfasser hier als *Gesammelte Studien* vorgelegten Aufsätze sind untereinander in Idee und Methode so stark verbunden, daß auch der Haupttitel *Goethe in Umwelt und Folgezeit* von dieser Einheit nur ein bescheidenes Bild gibt. Es handelt sich in ihnen um das echt Goethische Problem, das der Dichter schon 1775 in seiner *Zugabe* zu Lavaters *Physiognomischen Fragmenten* ausspricht, und um das (unausgesprochen) diese acht Aufsätze zu kreisen scheinen: „Nur getrost, was den Menschen umgibt, wirkt nicht allein auf ihn, er wirkt auch wieder zurück auf selbiges, und indem er sich modifizieren läßt, modifiziert er wieder rings um sich her. . . . Die Natur bildet den Menschen, er bildet sich um, und diese Umbildung ist doch wieder natürlich; er, der sich in die große, weite Welt gesetzt sieht, umzaunt, ummauert sich eine kleine drein und staffiert sie aus nach seinem Bilde.“ (DJG V 322)

Der erste Aufsatz kontrastiert die *Confessions* mit *Dichtung und Wahrheit*. Der Außenseiter Rousseau analysiert seine Fähigkeiten und Fertigkeiten und sieht in seiner Entwicklung eine Entwertung natürlicher Anlagen zum künstlichen Gesellschaftsmenschen; Goethe stellt dieser Anklageschrift gegenüber das versöhnende Bild der organischen Entwicklung eines Naturgebildes, typisch in seiner Art, normal in seiner Ganzheit, sich vollendend im Geben und Nehmen. Wandlung an und in dieser Welt der sozialen Gegebenheiten untersucht der zweite Aufsatz, *Goethe und sein Publikum*, ein Problem, das der dritte, *Jakob Michael Reinhold Lenz und Goethes Werther*, zur Einzeluntersuchung vertieft, die sowohl das Wesen beider Dichter wie ihre Schaffensform wechselseitig erhellt. Lenz selbst, mit dem Herzen in Werthers, mit dem Kopfe in St. Preux' Nähe, in ewiger Selbstanalyse und nie ausgetragenen Zwiespalt zwischen rationalem und irrationalen Wesen, weist auf Rousseau zurück.

Der fünfte Aufsatz bildet die eigentliche Mitte des Buches, und indem er den *Weg zur Klassik in Goethes Schriften zur Kunst und Literatur* nachzeichnet, weist er darauf hin, wie stark der junge Goethe vor dem Sturm und Drang von der Kunstlehre des Klassizismus durchdrungen war und durch Eingliederung in eine feste Tradition gefeit gegen das Zerfließen in Gefühlsästhetik. Goethes Reaktion gegen die Regel, die bei aller Polemik gegen einengende Formeln dem Genie schließlich doch die innere Form zuspricht, ließe sich übrigens seiner Stellung den eignen Werken dieser Zeit gegenüber vergleichen, deren einseitige Helden das Korrektiv und die Reservatio des Gesunden und Tüchtigen im Wesen ihres Schöpfers verlangen. So ist Revolution hier eigentlich nur Reaktion oder, wie Sommerfeld sagt, „nicht sowohl negative Wendung gegen

ein Bestehendes sondern vielmehr positive Neu-Fundamentierung." Andererseits hat man dann bei der bis zum Schulmeisterlichen gehenden Betonung der Regel in Goethes Spatzeit wiederum das Gefühl, daß auch sie mit der Reservatio des Genies aufzufassen ist. Dieser Ausgleich wird in Sommerfelds Abhandlung klar genug, und es ist wohlthuend, einmal ein tapferes Wort für die Tradition des Klassizismus zu finden, wo sonst nur die Ablehnung, die mit Lessing einsetzt, von jeder Generation übertrumpft wird.

Gerahmt ist dieser Aufsatz von zwei einander entsprechenden: der eine zeigt das theatralische Kindheitserbe des Dichters, das oft unterschätzt wird, der andre nimmt Stellung zu lyrischem Stofferbe und setzt in vorbildlicher Analyse von Beispiel und Gegenbeispiel Goethische Gedichte in Relief, nicht zum Zwecke der Entwertung geringerer Vorläufer und Nachfolger, sondern zur Verdeutlichung ihrer Eigenart, wie sie sich in Stil und Gestaltung verrät.

Mit dem Überblick über *Die dichterische Autobiographie von Goethe bis Nietzsche* und dem Bericht über *Die Aufnahme von Goethes Wahlverwandschaften im 19. Jahrhundert* schließt sich der Kreis. Auch hier finden wir die wechselseitige Erhellung Goethes und seiner Nachfahren oder seines Publikums, erzielt durch Einzelanalyse und literarische Ortsbestimmung, wie sie das ganze Buch charakterisiert. Sicher und einleuchtend in der Methode, subtil und streng im Gedanken, klar und gepflegt in der Form, empfiehlt es sich auch äußerlich durch ein würdiges Gewand. Möge sich bald der erwartete zweite Band dem ersten gesellen.

ERNST FEISE

Schillers Urbilder. Von HERMAN PONGS. Stuttgart. I. B. Metzler, 1935. Pp. 52.

Professor Pongs' short but very profound book offers a new approach to Schiller in so far as the author reveals the primal images as the determinants of Schiller's main characters. These characters are not to be conceived as independent, isolated figures but as deeply rooted in their particular basis of existence, their "Existenzgrund." This is already apparent in Schiller's first drama. Its hero, Karl Moor, can be considered a man within a group, "ein Mensch der Gruppe," and he is determined in his actions by the paternal spirit, the "Vatergeist." This primal image which, in its widest sense, includes the ruler of a people as well as the people for whom the ruler is a father, dominates almost all of Schiller's works. Influenced by the counter-image of the tyrannical ruler Schiller deviated in *Fiesko* "from the primal image which the paternal spirit had developed in him." (14) But in *Don Carlos* the ideal of a king is conceived as a father, and the people, although still

in the background, suggest for the first time the "existential basis in which the ideal of freedom gains its reality." (18) Wallenstein too cannot be imagined without the traces of a father, and his deep metaphysical insecurity and final downfall depend upon the fact that he lacks "close contact with the most natural of communal bodies, the people." (26) In him characteristic features of Fiesco and Posa, "Urbildzuge des damonischen Politikers," reappear in monumental proportions. *Maria Stuart* is still more deeply rooted in the elemental sphere. This time two women rule in the political world, that is to say, in the world of the paternal spirit, and they too are primal images of "damonische Naturen." (28) In *Die Jungfrau von Orleans*, for the first time, both a living people and the ideal of a paternal ruler appear as the existential basis of the heroine and as the determinants of her actions, while in *Wilhelm Tell* a living people itself is the active element with the hero in the center as the embodiment of the paternal spirit of his people. (35) *Demetrius* finally reveals the elemental tension between the individualities of two peoples, the Poles and the Russians. At the end Professor Pongs considers briefly the rôle of the women in Schiller's dramas.

It is a very unified picture which Professor Pongs presents here and his points are well proved. His book is furthermore significant as an indication of a new trend in German literary research, the "existenzielle Richtung," which is directly or indirectly influenced by the contemporary "Existenzphilosophie" of Jaspers and Heidegger and supplements the "geisteswissenschaftliche Richtung" advocated by Dilthey. It may seem, however, that Professor Pongs' intention to refute those critics who had called Schiller an abstract philosophical poet and rational moralist misled him to occasional overstatements with regard to the dependence of Schiller's dramatic heroes. For "Existenz" or actualization of "Existenz" in Jaspers' terminology depends on the continuous tension between and interrelation of the individual and the world, both of them autonomous forces which are, at the same time, inseparably bound up with one another. In this respect the moral problems of freedom and of guilt are presented by Schiller from both sides, that is to say, in their existential significance. The individual is not free in the sense that he is entirely independent, he possesses, however, freedom of will and is therefore as a moral being alone responsible for his deeds. This polarity of existence could have been emphasized still more strongly than Professor Pongs does it.

Princeton University

HANS JAEGER

Un Poète romantique allemand. Ludwig Tieck (1773-1853). Par ROBERT MINDER. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1936. Pp. viii, 516. Fr. 60. (Pubs. . . . Univ. de Strasbourg, 72.)

A doctoral thesis of 525 large octavo pages on an important author, which presents neither a cursory and superficial summary or rehashing of facts well known, nor a specialized investigation of certain abstruse and secondary phases of that writer's work, but rather a detailed, carefully reasoned and independent analysis of the man and his whole literary production, extending over the most significant fifty years of German literature, may indeed be called a novelty. Dr. Minder, now of the University of Nancy, has devoted many years of careful research and thought to this study. He may well be proud of the result.

After a preface in which the purpose and method of the work are explained—it is not in any sense a biography or a biographical study, but an attempt to resolve the component parts of Tieck's character as well as his works into their elements and to show the underlying forces, motives and ideas thereof—we are given a very important introduction, or prolog, on the great themes of Tieck's intimate experience and of his literary production. The principal motifs of his own experience, which determine his character, are found in his constant recollection of a "Paradise," his perception of a "Chaos," and his delight in play or make-believe. His works fall just as significantly into two classes, those of "mystification," and those of "participation," while four great leading themes pervade them, which Minder succinctly characterizes by the names of four of Tieck's typical protagonists: Fortunat, Lovell, Bertha (in the tale *Der blonde Eckbert*) and Genoveva. This classification may no doubt be criticised as too schematic and simple, and even too incomplete, for so complex and multifarious a man as Tieck, but it serves the purpose by and large.

The body of the book is divided into two large parts, the first being on the forms, motifs and evolution of Tieck's works, the second on the formation and aspects of his emotional life (we thus translate the French word *sensibilité*) and ideology. Here all is as perspicuous and systematic as only the Gallic temperament can make it. But for that it does not suffer from lack of thorough documentation, either. The three chapters of the first part deal with a) the lyric output, b) the drama, and c) the prose works, these being again subdivided into four classes (early novels, fantastic tales, *Sternbald* as the Romantic novel *par excellence*, and the later Dresden *Novellen* as examples of *réalisme modéré*). The second part of the book is far bulkier. It is divided into thirteen chapters, which deal with such topics as Tieck's "synesthetic" temperament, the part which the family and family relationships played in his life, his love affairs and friends, his attitude toward nature, his political, social, philosophical, religious and esthetic

ideals, his reaction to music and painting, and his significant position as a critic of the theatre and of literature.

An important epilog of twenty pages sums up the author's conclusions. We quote (pp 450-451): "Tieck was never the great lord of letters that he sometimes dreamed he was. He did not rediscover the art of Shakespeare, Cervantes and Goethe, an art which was to be the sum total expression of a nation and a people. Very few of his works are truly perfect. Writers much more limited in their inspiration, like Eichendorff or Morike, almost instinctively achieved that equilibrium between reality and poetry to which Tieck devoted so much thought. If ambition, confusion of mind, a ridiculous exaggeration or ignorance of his capabilities had led the poet to a desire to follow models which were too great, and to disown the perfect dandy which to some extent he might have become, his efforts would be quite forgotten today, just like those of Wilhelm Jordan or of any of the grandiloquent failures of any period. But the universal and indeed quite personal culture of Tieck, his accurate instinct for true as well as misunderstood values, his fine appreciation for the technical aspects of art, his belief in the reality of Mystery, his sincerity and charm—all these cause his noble desire for great art and his craving for synthesis to retain an active value to this very day, quite apart from the merits of any of his writings."

That Dr. Minder throws much light on hitherto neglected aspects of Tieck goes without saying. His association of Tieckean tendencies with the more modern Freudian school, the influences of Karl Philipp Moritz's "psycho-physiology" and the analysis of Tieck's works according to motifs are but a few illustrations.

The forty-page bibliography which concludes the work is arranged topically and will prove of inestimable value to any future student of Romanticism in general or of Tieck in particular. It overlooks nothing worth-while. American scholarship, too, comes in for its full measure of appreciation—a statement which can not always be made of literary studies emanating from Europe. Errors and omissions in connection with Tieck's relation to France (p. 488) will be corrected in a forthcoming article on which Dr. Minder and the present reviewer are collaborating. In this field it is worth while calling attention to the apparent affinity of Tieck and the *surréalistes* of 1925. Four unusual likenesses of the German Romanticist enhance the value and attractiveness of the book.

Readers of Dr. Minder's thesis who are also familiar with the present writer's biography of Tieck, *Ludwig Tieck, the German Romanticist* (Princeton University Press, 1935), which came out about six months earlier, will probably note that while these two studies follow widely divergent modes of approach and have quite different purposes, their conclusions are strikingly similar. Although Dr. Minder and the writer have been in rather close

touch for some years and have even exchanged materials and views, this similarity is anything but pre-arranged. Even had this been desired, the work of both was too far advanced at the time they came in contact to permit any such eventuality. It is due solely to the fact that two investigators working in the same field and using in great part the same evidence have arrived at almost identical results. Unfortunately it was not possible, however, to give Dr. Minder access to the collection of unpublished letters, gathered from numerous sources, which the reviewer hopes soon to publish in collaboration with Professor Robert Herndon Fife and Dr. Percy Matenko.

In summary it may be said that Tieck is now no longer one of the major enigmas of German literature, as he had been for so many years. The facts and the deductions therefrom have at last been laid open. Later scholars may present new interpretations. But that applies not only to Tieck but to any author, and rightly so.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL

University of Cincinnati

Krisenjahre der Fruhromantik. Briefe aus dem Schlegelkreis herausgegeben von JOSEPH KORNER. Erster Band. Brunn, Wien, Leipzig. Verlag Rudolf M. Rohrer, 1936. Pp. xxiv + 670 (two additional volumes to appear in 1937). Price of set: 50 Marks.

Readers of this journal who have been following the present reviewer's notices of previous works by Professor Korner of the German University of Prague, especially his *Die Bruder Schlegel*, *Briefe aus fruhen und spaten Tagen der deutschen Romantik* (1926), *Briefe von und an A. W. Schlegel* (1930), and *Friedrich Schlegels neue philosophische Schriften* (1935), have undoubtedly been looking forward with interest to the appearance of this new work, for it puts the finishing touch upon the grand edifice which Korner has been patiently and laboriously constructing for the past twenty years. It presents, chiefly, the bulk of that part of the A. W. Schlegel-Nachlass which for over one hundred years reposed in Mme de Stael's Coppet castle, until it was discovered by Korner in August, 1929. Other letters from various sources have been added thereto.

To be sure, the present volume contains only one-third of the material to be presented in this work as a whole. During the course of the present year the second volume, with some three hundred additional letters, and the third, with an exhaustive commentary, will make their appearance. The present bulky

volume of nearly seven hundred pages contains 320 letters beginning with 1791 and running chronologically through 1808. But by far the great majority are from the quinquennium between 1804 and 1808 and are written either by or to A. W. Schlegel. The chief correspondents, beside the protagonist himself, are Ludwig Tieck's sister Sophie, Friedrich Schlegel, Dorothea Mendelssohn-Schlegel, Schelling, Georg Reimer, the Fouqués, Mme de Stael and August Stael. Others are Arnim, Bernhardt, Brockhaus, Cotta, Hulsén, Jacobi, Schleiermacher and Zacharias Werner, to mention but a few.

Our factual knowledge of the development of the so-called Jena Romanticists between 1790 and 1800 has been pretty full for some time, thanks to various sources. We have also had sufficient light thrown upon the Younger Romanticists of a decade later. But the decade between 1800 and 1810 had been more or less left in darkness. Now, thanks to Korner, this last veil has been lifted, and a flood of light is shed upon it. It would take us too far afield to note all the new facts and fascinating details which greet us in Korner's pages. We can indicate but a few in this place. For instance, the estrangement of the two Schlegel brothers in 1801, caused by Caroline, did not last as long as has been thought, although their relations never became hearty again. Friedrich did not even tell his brother of his conversion in 1808. This conversion, as we see again, was thoroughly sincere. Friedrich's close relations with Mme de Stael are revealed for the first time.

August Wilhelm's relations with Tieck's sister Sophie come to light in all their bald ugliness.¹ Her letters, especially the clandestine ones, often read like chapters of a salacious novel. His are no less interesting and characteristic. His poem to her shortly before the birth of her son Felix, written in the erroneous belief that he is the real father (actually the father was not Sophie's husband Bernhardt, but von Knorring!), is a literary curiosity of the first water. We now know that the chief reason for August Wilhelm's leaving Germany in 1804 and for following Mme de Stael to her Swiss banishment was his disappointment in love by Sophie. Moreover, we see that Mme de Stael proved a worthy substitute for Tieck's sister.

It becomes clear also that August Wilhelm was intellectually always dependent upon his brother Friedrich and that August Wilhelm and Friedrich Tieck, the artist-brother of Ludwig, were close friends. We learn the real reasons for Friedrich Schlegel's removal to Vienna and the details of his difficulties there. We become better acquainted with the extremely kindly nature of Dorothea Mendelssohn-Schlegel and find to our surprise that

¹ The main facts were related by the reviewer in his *Ludwig Tieck, the German Romanticist*, Princeton, 1935, pp 157, 172, 179, 185 etc. Professor Korner had kindly placed these data at the writer's disposal four years before the publication of *Krisenjahre*.

August Wilhelm did not break with Schelling and Caroline even after his divorce from Caroline and her marriage to Schelling. Finally we get an insight into Friedrich Schlegel's opinions of the younger Romantics, Arnim, Brentano, Fouqué and Zacharias Werner.

The eight full-page half-tones are excellent and valuable because they were unknown to our generation. The fifteen-page introduction by Korner gives us the necessary background. In heartily recommending the work to all college and university libraries and to scholars interested in German Romanticism, we cannot refrain from quoting the last paragraph of this introduction:

Mit dem Coppeter Fund ist das grosse Leck unseres Quellenvorrats zur Geschichte der deutschen Romantik nun endlich geschlossen, die aus zahlreichen anderen Fundstellen erbrachten Zutaten füllen die kleineren Lucken, die in den bisherigen Publikationen noch bestanden hatten. Im grossen wie im kleinen darf ich dieses Werk daher als abschliessend bezeichnen, sowohl hinsichtlich meiner eignen älteren Briefeditionen wie in bezug auf die intimen Dokumente des Schlegelkreises überhaupt. Dessen Art und Bedeutung, seine wandlungsreiche Geschichte in Früh-, Hoch- und Spätromantik liegt nun mit aller wünschbaren Klarheit zutage.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL

University of Cincinnati

Luise Hensel als Dichterin. Von Dr. FRANK SPIECKER. Evanston, Northwestern University Studies in the Humanities, No. 3, and Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1936. Pp. 207.

The story of the life of Luise Hensel (1798-1876), that remarkably precocious maladjusted introvert and convert who deserves a place among the lesser lights of the second-generation Romantics, has been told before—by Reinkens (1877), Bartscher (1882), Binder (1885) and others. Dr. Frank Spiecker of Northwestern University did not wish to write another biography of her. To be sure, he has once more narrated briefly the sad tale of her struggles, shedding new light here and there with the help of the 'Nachlass' in Munich. But his chief aim, which he carries out with some success, was to present a "psychological study" of her as a poet on the basis of the unpublished material, and to publish a sheaf of her hitherto unknown poems.

Dr. Spiecker himself admits in his epilog (p. 145) that he has not changed the contours of the picture; only the background has come out in darker colors. The reasons for her conversion to the Catholic faith and for her comparative silence and lack of development as a poet after passing her teens, and the various factors leading to her peculiar melancholia are discussed at length. As the

author depicts her, Luise Hensel bears a striking resemblance to that host of woman-converts which the history of German Romanticism records—gentle souls and misfits like Marie Alberti or Dorothea Tieck, who hovered all their lives between asceticism and worldly love. One thing is certain. No contemporary of Luise Hensel can compare with her in the field of simple, naive, unaffected lyrics of the religious type. But the question to what extent she was really a Romanticist and to what extent a late-born follower of Gellert's rococo manner is not answered.

The style of the book seems suited to the subject. Sentimental phrases like "der gute Vater" (p. 20), "der innigstgeliebte Bruder" (38), "Sonnenschein und Tranentau" (129), "der Schnitter Tod" (22), "der Todesengel" (128 and 143), and inconsistencies like "Conversion" (5) and "Konversion" (104) are too frequent. The convenient "derselbe" is overworked, and the auxiliary of the perfect tenses in dependent clauses is usually omitted. Footnotes on well-known figures of Romanticism are needlessly full (cf. pp. 44 and 45). Four times we are told that the poet was born in Linum (p. 11, p. 15 twice, and p. 122 note 68).

A frontispiece giving her brother Wilhelm's drawing of Luise, and five facsimiles of poems and letters in manuscript adorn the volume.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL

University of Cincinnati

Simon Roths Fremdwörterbuch herausgegeben von EMIL ÖHMANN
[Mémoires de la Société néo-philologique de Helsingfors XI,
1936, pp. 225-370].

Simon Roth's *Teutscher Dictionarius* is not only one of the most important, but also one of the rarest German dictionaries of the sixteenth century, only three copies each of the first edition (1571) and of the second edition (1572) being known. The author, as Öhmann has established with approximate certainty, is identical with the Simon Roth whose history is given in the *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie* xxix, 340, a fact that had not been suspected previously. Roth was a native of Styria, but lived in Bavaria, at Neu-Ötting on the Inn, not far from the Austrian border.

The manner of reproduction of the book is rather unusual: the text of the dictionary (pp. 277-361) is given in a line-for-line but not page-by-page reproduction of the original, with signatures and catch-words, which are liable to come anywhere on the page of the reprint, no page-numbers of the original, on the other hand, are indicated, and so the page-headings, which may come near the bottom of a column in the reprint (compare AS. AT. AV on page

291) look rather queer, and at first glance unintelligible. Moreover, there is no bibliographic description of the original, not even the number of pages or leaves is indicated; the title of the new edition is given as *Simon Roths Fremdwörterbuch*, whereas the fac-simile of the original title-page given on page 277 reads: *Ein Teutscher Dictionarius . . . durch Simon Roten*.

The text proper of the dictionary is preceded by an introduction (pp. 225-273) in which there are grammatical and lexicographical discussions by the editor; and following the text there is an alphabetically-arranged commentary (pp. 362-370), which at the same time serves as an index to the words treated in the introduction. The passages discussed by the editor might profitably have been amplified, as there are dozens, perhaps hundreds of additional expressions deserving comment, for their early, or late, or even unique occurrence; for example *vberwirttel* (COQUIN)¹ from *uber werden*, *Gerhab* (CURATOR) cf. *Lexen* I, 878, *auffnutzen* (DECORATION); *vergwanten* (DEFENDIRN), *dauchung* (DEPRESSION); *Haren* (ENUTRIERN), *Tildtap*, *pluntz* (FAEX), *leycher*, *finantzer* (FALSARIUS); *Hochzeitlicher tag* (FEST); *stertzer* (FRATZ), *pfulment* (FUNDAMENT), *zwickleten* (FURCKL); *frutig*, *gsparig* (GNAU), *Loßtag* (IANUARIUS), *herein schwantzen* (INCEDIRN), *fortel* (INTROIT), *fauler schlientz* (LANTZL; FRATZ), *Rogelmachung* (LAXIERUNG); *schmellern*, *schwenden*, *schwinieren* (MINUIRN), *schnaphandl*, *parthansel* (PASTPINTER), *tostiger* (PHLEGMATICUS), *misch masch* (QUODLIBET); *Mawen oder wider dewen*; *mauung* (RUMINIERN); *Puttermuß* (SCHMARN); *yetzlen* (SUGILLIERN); *vertuschung* (SUPPRESSION).

On pages 271-273 the editor enumerates the misprints of the original that have been corrected in the reprint; the following passages should likewise have been amended: in the *Vorrede* (p. 283) there is a Latin quotation which has evidently been corrupted: *Rarum cha vilescit quotidianum*, under ADULATOR we have one definition: *Ja Herr, rc.* These last letters are the abbreviation for etc.: only on p. 303, under DECLAMATION and DECLINIERN, is the correct transcription given, elsewhere, in dozens of passages, the unwary reader is confronted by the enigmatical letters *rc*; DISPUTIERN is defined as „Behawen, beschneyden, schnarten, stumblen, das vbrig hinweg thun. Item *Translatiue*, das ist entlehenter weiß. Ein gsprach vmb ein ding halten. . .” *Behawen* and the like do not at all define *Disputiurn*, evidently another word, a synonym of *dissecare*, *dissicere*, has accidentally dropped out. OCCIDENT is defined as „Nidergang, das ort da die Sonn nider oder zu genaden gehet.” What is *zu genaden gehen*? Presumably a misprint for *zu gaden gehen*. cf. Fischer, *Schwabisches Wbch.* „Zu Gaden gehen = Besuch machen.” TAFERN is defined as „. . . Herberg.

¹ The word in parentheses is the heading under which the word under discussion occurs

Jtem werckstatt, kamerladen, kauffladen", instead of *kamerladen* read *kramerladen*. Under TROßLER there is the definition: „... der Landtsknecht büben, so . . . auff den raub gericht seind, In die hennen kobel steygen." This last phrase evidently belongs under the following entry TROßIRN „... auff dem raub vmbgehn, hin vnnd her glocklen. . . ."

Most of the following misprints are presumably due to the latest editor: for *vngesehrlich* (ADOLESCENT) read *vngefehrlich*; for IACTUR read IACTUR, for *Tusscensch* (LATIN) read *Tuscensch*; for *paisselber* (MOST) read *praissselber*; for *etgas* (ORGL) read *etwas*; for Harm (VRIN) read *Harn*.

On account of the rarity of the original edition—I have never seen a copy offered for sale—the reprint, even with its shortcomings, is a most welcome addition to the apparatus of the worker in the field of German etymology and lexicography.

W. KURRELMAYER

Zur Vorgeschichte des Beowulf. By WALTER A. BERENDSOHN.

Mit einem Vorwort von Professor Otto Jespersen. Kopenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard, 1935. 302 pages.

Guided by his own formula of the normal development of an epic poem, Berendsohn has undertaken to trace the *Beowulf* back through each of the three assumed stages of its formation. First, he tries to remove what was contributed by the Christian Anglian composer of the book-epic in its actual form. From the remnant and from Scandinavian materials he constructs the fusion of folk-tale and heroic poetry which he considers to have been the second stage. From this in turn by an involved process of elimination, substitution, and comparison with Scandinavian materials, together with frankly admitted guesses, he arrives at the outlines of the group of sixth century Germanic heroic poems presenting episodes of aristocratic warrior life, free of supernatural elements, which he postulates as the first stage of the epic. Berendsohn holds that each of the three kinds of poetry constituting these presumed strata of the actual *Beowulf*—heroic lays, folk-tale imbedded in heroic material, Christianized book-epic—has such clearly recognizable differences in motif and style that he can separate each layer from the other.

Berendsohn's procedure in discriminating between what the *Beowulf* poet himself contributed and what he took over from his immediate sources is determined chiefly by what he conceives to be the patchwork character of the *Beowulf* and the composer's feebleness as a poet. He declares: "Überall verstreut in seinem Buchepos finden sich Bruchstücke älterer Dichtungen, die unverkennbare

Stilmerkmale anderer Lebenskreise an sich tragen, die er [the composer of the *Bēowulf*] also nicht wirklich eingeschmolzen, sondern verhältnissmässig wenig verändert aufgenommen und notdurftig verbunden hat." (p. 22). Berendsohn's characterization of the *Bēowulf* poet is expressed in the following contemptuous fashion: "Er kann nicht gegendständlich denken, nicht geradlinig erzählen, nicht anschaulich gestalten. Er schmilzt den Rohstoff der Quellen nicht in seiner Werkstatt ein zu ganz neuem Guss, er stückt einander fremde Teile notdurftig zusammen. Vor allem strebt er mit allen Mitteln nach grossem Umfang seines Werkes durch Anschwellung und Ausweitung sowie durch Einfügung immer neuer, teilweise ganz unzugehöriger Stoffmassen" (p. 79). And the method of composition is thus described: "Ich stelle mir den alten, buchgebildeten, schreibenden Mann vor mit einer Menge von Manuskripten auf seinem Arbeitstisch. Er schreibt bald eine Stelle ab, bald arbeitet er eine andere um, bald gibt er von einer gelesenen Dichtung einen berichtenden Auszug, bald lasst er sich eine Volkssage erzählen, die ihm für sein Werk brauchbar erscheint. Es ist völlig undenkbar, dass er mit seinem schwachen Gedächtniss für die verschiedenen Teile der eigenen Dichtung seine Quellen im Kopfe trug, sodass er sie über grosse Strecken wortwörtlich wiedergeben konnte. Soweit er aus versgebundenen Dichtungen schöpft, also abgesehen von den Volkssagen, die er gehört hat, ist er ein Zusammensetzer und Bearbeiter schriftlich festgelegter Werke." (p. 80).

Coupled with this contempt for the poetical incompetence of the composer of the *Bēowulf* and for his *Schreibtischmachwerk* Berendsohn has boundless enthusiasm for what he considers to have been the unfailingly brilliant technical artistry of the old Germanic heroic poetry—its dramatic character, its terseness, directness, concreteness, and vividness. Indeed the more carefully I examine Berendsohn's study the more convinced I become that his enthusiasm for the heathen heroic poetry is largely responsible for the analysis he makes, for the fragments which he picks out as belonging to this layer of older poetry and for the remainder which he assigns to the composer of the actual *Bēowulf*. Although I consider Berendsohn's detailed analyses of motifs and stylistic features of the *Bēowulf* of very great interest in themselves, the conclusions he bases upon them appear to me to have but little objective validity. In my judgment these conclusions are determined primarily by his unqualified admiration for what he conceives to have been the intense effectiveness of ancient Germanic heroic poetry and his corresponding contempt for the incompetence of the *Bēowulf* poet.

Selected from the whole extent of the *Bēowulf* Berendsohn picks out 506 1-2 verses which after repeated testing and reflection he considers to be old "bis auf einzelne Wörter und Wendungen." (p. 83). These verses form more than 100 fragments, ranging in extent from a single verse to a group of 28 verses.

Of these 506 1-2 verses Berendsohn believes that 483 belong to the most important single direct source of the *Bēowulf*, a hypothetical unified epic, written down and running to 750-850 verses, which he calls the *Grendeldichtung*. He is inclined to believe that the composer of this assumed epic was a wandering scop of the seventh century and the place of composition somewhere within the Anglian territory of England. In this *Grendeldichtung* the events were ordered to present the biography of the hero from his earliest youth through the celebration of his funeral rites. The two central episodes, presented in detail, were the hero's fight with a supernatural monster and his death in a decisive battle. In this reconstructed immediate source of the *Bēowulf* there was no fight with a female monster, and instead of the dragon fight there was a battle between Swedes and Geats.

Berendsohn holds that although many of the details of the fight with Grendel's dam as presented in the *Bēowulf* came from the account of the fight with Grendel in the *Grendeldichtung*, the introduction of the female monster is due to the *Beowulf* poet himself, as is evidenced by the incompetence of the handling, by the confusion her introduction brings into the narrative, and by the statement that God saved Beowulf. The *Bēowulf* poet did not invent this episode, however, but simply inserted a tale he had heard from the folk, a tale coming from Celtic-Irish story. When in verses 1345-46 he makes Hroþgar say:

Ic þæt londbūende	lēode mīne
seleræðende	seġan hýrde

it is "wahrscheinlich, dass der Angle dem König in den Mund legt, was ihm selbst geschehen ist: er hat wirklich eine Volkssage gehört." (p. 63).

For the account of the hero's death in battle against human foes in the *Grendeldichtung* the Christian composer or compiler of the *Bēowulf* is assumed to have substituted that of his being killed by the dragon in order thus still further to idealize him as God's champion against supernatural monsters and to make his death "ein Opfer im Dienste Gottes gegen seine Feinde, die Schädiger des Menschengeschlechts." (p. 71).

The *Grendeldichtung* differed from the *Bēowulf* not only in fundamental features through lacking the episode of Grendel's dam and through having Beowulf slain by human foes instead of by a dragon, but also in important details. For example, it did not have the figure of Unferð at all. Instead, Æschere appeared as Hroþgar's counselor, and in place of a mere word combat between Beowulf and Unferð there was a duel between Beowulf and Æschere in which Æschere was slain. Beowulf's reply to Æschere's taunt that Breca had defeated him in swimming was so insulting that a duel to the death between Beowulf and Æschere was inevitable.

The Grendel adventure in the *Grendeldichtung* Berendsohn

thinks may be reconstructed by supplying only about 100 verses to the appropriate fragments selected from the *Bēowulf*. For the reconstruction of the other central episode, the battle in which Beowulf fell, Berendsohn relies most heavily upon comparisons with parts of the versions of the Bjarki-Biarco stories, since he considers these Bjarki stories later derivatives from this hypothetical *Grendeldichtung*. By an elaborate series of manipulations of proper names and comparison of details he identifies not only Beowulf with Bjarki but also both Beowulf's follower Hondscio who was slain by Grendel and his devoted kinsman-retainer Wiglaf who alone supported him in the dragon fight with Bjarki's follower Hott-Hjalti. His ultimate conclusion is: "Im Kern sind die Bjarkamál m. E. ein Überlieferungsweig des II Teils der Grendeldichtung und enthalten in später Umbildung die Entscheidungsschlacht, in der Bjarki-Beowulf fiel." (pp. 222-223). Since the Bjarki stories are assumed to have undergone great transformations during the centuries before they were written down Berendsohn has little hesitation in adapting this material freely to his reconstruction of the *Grendeldichtung*.

It was the composer of the *Grendeldichtung* who imbedded in an already existing heroic poem the folk-tale encounter with a supernatural monster. The account of Grendel—the fight, the pursuit to the mere, the beheading, etc.—he drew from Celtic-Irish story. It was he also who broke the practice of uniting members of the same family through alliteration by making Beowulf the son of Ecgbæow. From England, where it was composed, the *Grendeldichtung* must have made its way into Denmark, from where it spread into Danish and Icelandic story. About 100 verses of the actual *Bēowulf*, in fragments of one or two verses each, Berendsohn assigns to the composition of the *Grendeldichtung* poet.

Enough has been said to indicate both Berendsohn's method and the character of his reconstructions, and it would be fruitless to follow him back step by step to his third stage of pure Germanic heroic poetry. This third stage he reconstructs into a Geatish poem on Ecgbæow, a Heaðobardic poem on Ingeld, and an intertwined group of Danish poems on the ill-fated Scylding dynasty, these Scylding poems constituting "*den Mutterboden der ganzen Überlieferung*." In arriving at the content and character of these poems Berendsohn seems to have felt free to select, omit, transpose, invent almost at will in order to work out unified and firmly knit stories with action adequately motivated and with no loose ends or *blinde Motive*. The sixth century he considers to have been a period of brilliant poetic activity centered at the Danish royal hall of Heorot, through which flowed a stream of heroic lays.

In an *Anhang zum Widsiþ* Berendsohn groups together *Widsiþ*, *Dēor*, *Waldere*, and *Bēowulf* as poems in which heathen Germanic heroic material has been more or less Christianized, and opposes this group to poems of definitely Christian composition. The latter he

assigns to Northumbria, the former to the Mercian court. He concludes that this heroic poetry in its pre-Christian form came to England with the Mercian royal family in the last quarter of the sixth century, or was brought over somewhat later through the contacts of the Mercian royal house with the continent.

On the whole, Berendsohn's study seems to me to represent genetic literary history at its speculative and too ingenious worst. Particularly unsound, it appears to me, is much of his procedure in the segregation of fragments of the actual *Bēowulf* as old and the justification of this segregation by an elaborate group of comparisons between these "old" remains and the material he assigns to the composer of the *Bēowulf*. The work also bears many indications of the haste and the spiritual stress under which Berendsohn states in his *Geleitwort* that it was prepared for publication. Much of the earlier part is confusing in arrangement and difficult to follow, and throughout there are numerous typographical errors.

W. F. BRYAN

Northwestern University

Three Medieval Centuries of Literature in England, 1100-1400. By CHARLES SEARS BALDWIN. Boston: Little, Brown, 1932. Pp. x + 274. \$1.75.

Professor Baldwin's survey takes the place of his earlier *Introduction to English Medieval Literature*, a work now out of print. In his Preface the author tells us that his book was "written to guide and help those who wish to study the medieval literature of England for themselves." It falls into ten chapters, followed by an appendix on ME grammar, 23 pages of notes, and an index. The volume as a whole is attractively done and makes pleasant reading; it ought to prove useful to those for whom it was designed. Unluckily, however, it does not fulfil the promise of its title; it is concerned, not with literature but with poetry. Eight lines, it is true, are given to a discussion of Old-English prose (pp. 48 f.), and no less than seven pages are devoted to Middle-English prose (over three of these are taken up by a Latin text and Wychf's translation of it, in parallel columns). Moreover, the author invades the fifteenth century (excluded from his survey by title) in order to give us a special section on Malory. Nevertheless, prose gets short shrift in this book, and the little that is said about it might better have been left unsaid. Thus, we are told that "for any wide development of native prose Anglo-Saxon history was hardly long enough" and on p. 195 one reads with some astonishment that "prose had long meant Latin prose, . . . but in the fourteenth century this field too was entered by the vernacular."

I will comment briefly on a few matters of detail. Snorri's patronymic is *Sturluson*, not *Sturlasson* (p. 9). The alliteration is occasionally defective or even wanting in the verses on pp. 18 ff. and 45 ff. The notion that the English in Saxon times saw the world, outside the hall, merely as a "place to fight in and to fight against" (p. 25) hardly agrees with such passages as *Seafarer* 48 f. The author, in his chapter on Old-English literature, passes over in silence the whole of the lyric poetry, beautiful though much of it is; when he comes to the *ubi sunt* theme (pp. 152 f.), he quotes, not the well-known passage in the *Wanderer*, but 28 lines from Villon! The author's use of the word *race* on pp. 30, 61, and 114 is not to be commended. The following statement wants correction. "Anglo-Saxon epic verse has short lines composed in two parts, called staves" (p. 30 f.). The remarks about OE syntax (p. 32) are most unfortunate, parataxis in the old poetry was a stylistic device, not a sign of the primitive state of the language in those days. Old English in fact was a mature, highly developed language; as Vocadlo puts it, "the more one studies Anglo-Saxon prose the more one realizes to what degree of perfection it attained" (*Prague Studies in English* iv, 62). The "conquered British Celts" played little if any part in Christianizing the English (p. 33). The author repeats as sober fact Wace's fable, now generally discredited, about Taillefer at Hastings (p. 50). Oriental influences are striking in Old as well as Middle English literature, and the same may be said of demons and the like; witness *Beowulf* (p. 62). It is hardly sound to connect with the Norman Conquest a simplification of the English inflexional system which had begun in the tenth century (p. 92); we have no reason to think that in the Middle Ages a "written standard" speech retarded the ordinary process of linguistic change, or that the removal of such a standard hastened such processes. For information about medieval preaching the reader should have been referred to G. R. Owst, *Preaching in Medieval England* (p. 248); Chambers has characterized Owst's book as "epoch-making."¹ The grammatical appendix wants revision, thus, it will not do to say that the *ow* of ME *knowe* etc. is to be pronounced as in modern English (p. 229).

KEMP MALONE

The Johns Hopkins University

CHAUCER, *The Pardoner's Tale*. Edited by CARLETON BROWN.
Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1935. Pp. xl + 63.

This excellent edition of Chaucer's masterpiece, though addressed chiefly to the student and the general reader, will be no

¹ R. W. Chambers, *On the Continuity of English Prose* (1932), p. xcix.

The fact is that in the Middle Ages, if the main trunks of the Seven Deadly Sins were distinct enough, their branches were inextricably interlaced and intertwined.

M. B. RUUD

University of Minnesota

The Parker Chronicle (832-900). Edited by A. H. SMITH. [Methuen's Old English Library]. Methuen & Co., Ltd., London, 1935. Pp. viii + 72. 2s.

A welcome addition to *Methuen's Old English Library* is Dr. Smith's selection from the Parker version of the *Chronicle*, he edits the material under the years, 832-900, inclusive. The editor provides us in the introduction and notes with a convenient résumé of recent scholarship on this portion of the *Chronicle*, and in the book as a whole he has succeeded (surprising in an Englishman) in making a useful class text-book, well organized and pleasing in mechanical details.

As must all future editions of the *Chronicle*, this selection leans heavily upon Plummer. We are pleased to see that Dr. Smith has, in his notes and introduction, conscientiously brought this portion abreast of present-day scholarship, especially of Mawer's important work on place names,—an aspect not adequately treated in other excerpts. His introduction and bibliography will provide the student with an interesting glimpse of O. E. scholarship, in spite of the fact that he limits the scope to one portion of a single MS. The selection of a single, continuous portion instead of the scattered parts usually found in OE readers results in a less diversified and possibly a less interesting sampling of what the whole *Chronicle* contains. But we agree with the editor's opinion that the historical value emerges more prominently over a continuous stretch. Certainly, the student cannot fail to sense a climax in the rise of Wessex to power through the test of fire and the sword; and, in spite of the "hide-and-go-seek" tactics of the Danes and the English, to feel something of the romance of Alfred's career.

The text is based upon a fresh study of the MS, collated with other editions, especially with that of Plummer. The edition is accurate and, on the whole, conservative. Capitalization and punctuation, however, are modern; abbreviations are expanded; and some normalizing is done (α = MS ϵ). In view of these sensible changes, the conservative retention of MS *wyn* (= *w*) appears inconsistent. In its capital form, it is almost indistinguishable from the capital *thorn* (θ); in its lower-case form, it is practically identical with *p*. The usual normalizing to *w*, or to the later MS form *uu*, would have been preferable. The format is duodecimo with

skilful arrangement of the page. The text appears in a clear and attractive form of roman type, followed by textual variants on each page. Exceptionally full notes at the bottom of the page bring to the student all necessary information. A glossary with complete grammatical data follows the bibliography at the end.

It is evident that Dr. Smith has spared no pains to make this a model text-book, and he deserves the gratitude of all teachers of Old English for incorporating so much scholarship in it. Also, as general editor of the whole series, he has helped to make the teaching of Old English more effective by bringing out a number of inexpensive but well edited texts, thus making it possible to present a more flexible course, without increase in cost, than is possible with a reader.

GEORGE WILLIAM SMALL

University of Maine

What Happens in Hamlet. By J. DOVER WILSON. New York: The Macmillan Co.; Cambridge, England: At the University Press, 1935. Pp. viii + 334 \$3.50.

Hamlet. By WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE. Edited by J. DOVER WILSON. Cambridge, England: At the University Press; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1934. Pp. xc + 290. \$2.50.

The Manuscript of Shakespeare's Hamlet and the Problems of its Transmission. By J. DOVER WILSON. Cambridge, England: At the University Press; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1934. 2 vols., pp. xx + 435. \$4.50.

With the appearance of *What Happens in Hamlet* Professor Dover Wilson has finished the last lap of his marathon run through the texts, the staging, and the dramatic technique of Shakespeare's masterpiece. Four volumes lie on the desk before us as trophies won upon the way. The sources and origin of all this toil are told us by Wilson himself in a delightful *Epistle Dedicatory*, addressed, somewhat in the style of the eighteenth century, to Walter Wilson Greg, which is prefixed to the last of the four volumes. Greg's audacious banishment of the Ghost as a mere figment of the disordered brain of the Prince of Denmark came into Wilson's hands during the World War and fired him with a high ambition to reinstate the majesty of buried Denmark. But at that time Wilson, as he frankly confesses, knew no more about *Hamlet* than the average reader, and to cross swords with a scholar like Greg involved the prolonged and arduous studies which have culminated in his latest book.

What final verdict can be pronounced on this long-continued effort? One at least may be entered simply and briefly: the Ghost is back in *Hamlet* as an objective reality and the mainspring of the tragedy. So much is sure: but Wilson's aim expanded as he worked and he now offers us a study of the "copy" for the texts, an edition with textual and exegetical comment, and an ingenious explanation of the dramatic problems of the play. Here, reluctantly, the verdict must be "not wholly satisfactory." A brief survey of the four volumes will indicate at least some of the reasons for this conclusion.

Of the three books that on the *Manuscript and Transmission* is the most scholarly. It is safe to say that no such meticulous and on the whole convincing study of the authentic texts, their sources, and mode of transmission, has ever been made. Neglecting for the time a consideration of *Q*₁, Wilson concentrates on the two good texts. Treating first the Folio version—from the time of Rowe the basis of modern editions—he shows that it is not derived from an emended copy of *Q*₂ but from a MS, which was itself a transcript of an earlier MS prepared from Shakespeare's original autograph with a view primarily for presentation at the Globe. But neither the first nor the second copy corresponds to the prompt book. Wilson, it is true, does not make this quite clear, but it is certain that this text contains far more lines than could possibly be spoken in the two hours traffic of the Elizabethan stage. We must imagine then a first transcript of Shakespeare's MS, made by Wilson's Scribe P—the prompter or stage manager—at the time when Shakespeare handed over his MS or "foul papers" to the company, and a second made years later when "copy" for *Hamlet* was needed for inclusion in the Folio. This second transcript Wilson attributes to C—"a player or theatrical scrivener thoroughly familiar with the play"—and readier to trust his active memory than to adhere conscientiously to the copy before him. Some of the most subtle and suggestive pages of Wilson's work deal with the different alterations of the authentic text due to the work of these scribes. P works for simplification, for clarity, and for economy of presentation on the stage, C on the other hand allows himself wide liberty in modernizing, paraphrasing, emending by sheer guess-work: he edits the text indeed with something of the free hand employed by eighteenth-century scholars. In fact the suspicion arises in your reviewer's mind that C must have been something more than a "scrivener", might he not have been a playwright connected with the company and employed by them as an extra job to prepare "copy" for Jaggard? A mere scrivener would hardly have ventured on such daring changes as *hyre and sallery* for *base and silly* (III, iii, 79), *tunes* for the more poetic *laudes* (IV, vii, 178), *tristfull* for *heated* (III, iv, 50), and *lunacies* for the incomprehensible *browes* (III, iii, 7).

Turning to the second quarto one may remark that it is unfortunate that Wilson insists on styling it the Q of 1605. There are but six copies of this edition extant; three of them bear the date of 1604, three that of 1605. The first three correspond to each other *litteratim et verbatim* with the exception of two trifling variants due not to corrections but to printing conditions (*vid.* my article in *MLN.*, XLIX, 377): the second three show some eighteen cases of variant readings and do not always agree with each other. It is plain that the 1604 copies represent an uncorrected, the 1605 a partially corrected state of the text. It seems fairly certain that we have here two issues of the play, the first in 1604, the second in 1605 when the date on the title page was changed in accordance with prevailing practice. Why disturb a long established nomenclature and introduce confusion into histories and text-books by insisting on an alteration of date that is at best just possible and on the whole unwarranted by the facts?

Wilson gives us good reason to believe that the "copy" for Q₂ was Shakespeare's original MS—"the true and perfect copie" of the title-page—no longer needed in the play-house (since a shorter and more legible transcript had been prepared to serve as a basis for the prompt-book) and so was readily available for "copy" when Roberts was engaged to print a correct edition of *Hamlet*. Yet in spite of his predilection for Q₂ Wilson is by no means ignorant of its imperfections; it is a "disgraceful" piece of printing, in this respect, and in this alone, inferior to F which presents a well-printed text. But the blunders in Q₂, misprints, strange spellings, omissions of words, lines and passages, can be traced almost without exception to the compositor, a young and inexpert printer who was pressed for time and had to set up what seemed to him a "pack of foul papers written in a crabbed hand." And it is almost always possible to get behind this compositor to his "copy" and to infer from what he printed the words that Shakespeare wrote. His omissions, accidental or intended, can, fortunately, be supplied from F. Wilson makes it quite clear that no modern edition of *Hamlet* can afford to neglect F, but it must be used as a corrective of Q₂, not as the basis of the text, since its errors, unlike those of Q₂, are due to wilful and arbitrary alteration. One of the most useful sections of these volumes is Appendix E where Wilson tabulates the variants in all three texts, and refers to the pages on which these variants are discussed. One may not always agree with Wilson's choice, but at least he always gives a reason for his decision. The two volumes are indispensable for any close student, let alone any future editor of *Hamlet*.

After such careful preparation one might expect from Professor Wilson something approximating a definitive edition of this play. That, in your reviewer's opinion, he has by no means given us. The long Introduction rehearses some of the main conclusions of

his earlier work and anticipates much of the matter of his concluding volume. There is some discussion of the remote source, Saxo, but little that is satisfactory of the immediate source of Shakespeare's play, the *Ur-Hamlet*. In spite of Wilson's distrust of the "historical school" of criticism, it would seem clear that Shakespeare's achievement cannot be fairly estimated unless we know the raw material which he transformed.

Turning to the text of the edition we may say in its praise that it is the first modern edition based, as Wilson has shown it should be, on the "true and perfect copie." Yet even so it is peppered, if the phrase may be allowed, with readings from F, many of which on Wilson's own principles, it would seem, should be excluded. Unfortunately the very first of his "editorial canons" (*Manuscript*, p. 178) viz "When a reading in either text . . . is pithier, more poetical, or more dramatic, that reading is to be preferred" leaves a wide door open for eclecticism in editing. What seems to the modern more poetical may not have seemed so at all to Shakespeare, and it is better to stick to the "true and perfect copie" and attribute the "more poetical" readings of F to the unbridled fancy of Scribe C. One regrets also to see *crucis* for which a satisfactory solution has been proposed left standing in the text as at I, iii, 74 and I, iv, 37. Yet this is perhaps less objectionable than the insertion in the text of emendations, ingenious and possibly correct, but not yet approved by the judgment of scholars as in III, iii, 7 and 79.

Following his practice in earlier volumes of the Cambridge Shakespeare, Wilson equips the text of *Hamlet* with elaborate and detailed stage-directions. These may be meant as a guide to the reader; they sometimes distress the scholar, especially when as in the case of "*he spreads his arms*" (I, i, 127) they represent a wilful alteration of the original. The stage-directions of the original texts are admittedly scanty and need supplementing for the reader, but Wilson seems at times to have gone to an unwarranted excess, one could almost imagine him annotating a prompt-book for production by a company under his direction.

What Happens in Hamlet is for the ordinary reader a more entertaining book than the preceding volumes. It is as exciting reading as a modern detective story and indeed the author's method is not unlike that of the detective who lighting upon unsuspected clues follows them up to the discovery of the hitherto unguessed secret. He makes no attempt, it is true, to pluck out the heart of Hamlet's mystery; that is the mystery of humanity itself, unsolvable except to the eyes of the Creator. Yet it seems at times as if his eager search led him to invent rather than to uncover the clues that he supposes Shakespeare to have concealed within the dialogue. It is a little hard to believe that the Lucianus of the play scene is a spoil-sport who almost wrecks Hamlet's Mouse-trap. It is even

more unlikely that Shakespeare at the very climax of the play seized the opportunity to "guy some rival company." Surely this would have set on "some quantity of barren spectators to laugh" at the very time they should have been tense with expectation of tragic consequences. On the other hand Wilson has given a good reason for Shakespeare's employment of the Dumb Show and an equally satisfactory explanation of the hitherto inexplicable failure of Claudius to stop the performance the moment this tell-tale show was staged.

In like manner Wilson's studies in Elizabethan spiritualism clear up as never before the cause of Hamlet's hysterical behavior after the revelation of the Ghost and his well-grounded apprehension, no mere evasion, that this spirit might be the devil playing upon and abusing his melancholy. Hamlet's fits of "sore distraction" are emphasized and his outrageous language to Ophelia and his mother explained if not excused. On the whole Wilson keeps his eyes firmly fastened upon the play and seldom forgets that *Hamlet* is a play and not a history or a case study in morbid psychology. Only occasionally does he seem to waver as when (p 164) he speaks of Hamlet's making the murderer of the Gonzago-play the nephew and not the brother of the King, as if it were a real Hamlet who wrote or altered the Gonzago play and not Shakespeare who found this story in his source and altered it in this fashion. Fortunately Wilson's deviations from the straight path are few and in no way impair his main conclusions.

Perhaps the best thing that can be said for the book is that it leads and sometimes even forces the reader to lay it down and pick up Shakespeare's play. Wilson's comments on the action are so acute, often so original, at times so challenging, that one is bound to recur to the text to see what his authority is and whether Shakespeare's words can be strained to warrant Wilson's opinion. In short he does here for the intelligent reader very much what Greg did for Wilson himself; he drives one back to the study, not of the Hamlet of romantic, historical, or psychological interpreters, but the Hamlet of the play, a character in an Elizabethan drama written by a great Elizabethan poet-playwright—no "artistic failure" as Eliot calls it, but the supreme achievement on the boards as in the closet of the master dramatist of modern times.

T. M. PARBOTT

Vanderbilt University

Richard Crashaw: A Study in Style and Poetic Development.

By RUTH C. WALLERSTEIN. Madison, Wisconsin: 1935. Pp. 160. \$2.00. (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, 37.)

Though she prefaces her work with a biographical sketch, Miss Wallerstein has chiefly purposed an interpretation of Crashaw's poetic evolution, analyzing the "paradox of unbridled sensuousness and unrestrained ingenuity, together aiming at abstract spirituality, which is the essence of his poetry." Save for the ambiguous "abstract," this definition satisfies; and though she uses "mystic" vaguely, she does not conceive of Crashaw as a "pure" poet elaborating a brilliant style expressive of nothing but—correctly—as one who, possessed of both religious and aesthetic interests, sought, and with considerable success achieved, their fusion.

For method, the book pursues a study of formative influences. The author analyzes the poet's apprenticeships to Latin rhetoric (with pertinent and hitherto unemployed citations from Buchler's *Thesaurus* and *Institutio Poetica*) and Marino. But quite as important in their directive shaping of his sensibility were, she believes, music and the pictorial arts. Upon rather slight evidence, she assumes Crashaw to have been deeply versed in music; she further assumes that one who was both poet and musician would write musical poetry, a theory open to question; and she argues that Crashaw owed the versification of his irregular odes to the "direct and immediate influence" of ecclesiastical unbarred polyphony. Suggestive as some of the analogies are, the thesis is incapable of demonstration. Another chapter ably considers Crashaw's imagery in the light of those contemporary blends of *dulce et utile*, the emblems and *imprese*. A fuller treatment of the analogy between the 'conceit' and these genres, Mario Praz' learned and copiously illustrated *Studi sul Concettismo* (Milano, 1934), appeared too late for Miss Wallerstein's use; but what she has said will stand.

Imperfectly proofread, uneven in composition, this is none the less a promising first book, for it is the work of one who has set herself the difficult but very important task of applying both sensibility and erudition to bear upon the history of literary style, a genre in which Morris W. Croll, providing a rare standard of excellence, has been almost her sole American predecessor. Miss Wallerstein's best pages, 81-97 and 125-8, in analysis of Crashaw's recurrent imagery and "private symbolism," will stimulate all critical students of literature and will raise expectation of her future monographs.

AUSTIN WARREN

Boston University

Milton's Lament for Damon and His Other Latin Poems. Rendered into English by WALTER SKEAT. With Preface and Introductions by E. H. VISIAK. London [and New York]: Oxford University Press, 1935. Pp. viii + 110. \$2.00.

This book should delight anyone who enjoys skilful poetic exercises in the Miltonic manner. It has the added advantage of being a distinctly new and ingenious translation of Milton's own Latin verses. Mr. Skeat has considerably revised his translation of the *Epitaphium Damonis* published by the Cambridge University Press in 1933, the revision doubtless being prompted, at least in part, by the interesting aim of the present volume: "to suggest the Miltonic atmosphere" by freely employing words and phrases, metrical devices, and orthography of Milton's usage. There was a hint of this in the earlier version, but here the promise is most admirably fulfilled. But anyone expecting to find here new light on the Latin verses, or a new translation of *all* the Latin verses, will certainly be disappointed. Mr. Skeat does not mention that he has omitted nine of the *epigrammata* which Milton chose to include in the 1673 edition of his poems.

In general Mr. Visiak's introductions to the various poems are not so new and skilful as the translations themselves. There is the usual (perhaps inevitable) heavy leaning upon Masson, although the editor might well re-read the first chapter of Masson's *Life* in order to resolve his perplexity (p. 71, n.) over the number of children in the Milton family. Moreover, since he has carefully pointed out that the first edition of the *Minor Poems* appeared in "1645 (Old Style)"—a mere assumption, incidentally,—he should have been able to decide (pp. 103-4) whether Milton was "Thirty-seven or Thirty-eight" on January 23, 1646 (Old Style), the date of composition of *Ad Joannem Rousum*. As these introductions cannot have been intended for the scholarly reader, it would be unfair to comment further upon their limitations.

WILLIAM R. PARKER

Ohio State University

BRIEF MENTION

A Bibliography of the Writings of Washington Irving: A Check List. Compiled by STANLEY T. WILLIAMS and MARY ALLEN EDGE. New York: Oxford University Press, 1936. Pp. xxii + 202. \$10. This valuable companion to Professor Williams's monumental *Life* "attempts to record all editions in all languages." It also includes a selective list of biographical and critical works on Irving. A title index adds to its usefulness.

H. S.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

Adams, Woodard, and Holmes.—A Census of Fr and Prov. dicts in American libraries. *Philadelphia*: Linguistic Soc. of America, 1937. Pp 17.

Allen, B. S.—Tides in Eng Taste (1619-1800) 2 v *Cambridge*: Harvard U. Press, 1937. Pp xviii + 269 + viii + 282.

Boyle, Roger, Earl of Orrery.—The Dramatic Works of —, ed W. S. Clark, II 2 v. *Cambridge*: Harvard U Press, 1937. Pp. xvi + 965 \$10 00.

Cowan, M.—Pitch and intensity characteristics of stage speech Iowa diss. Sup of Archives of Speech, Dec, 1936 Pp 92.

De La Mare, W.—Poetry in Prose. War-ton lecture *New York*: Oxford Univ Press, 1937. Pp 85. \$1 25. (Proc. of British Acad, 21)

Edgumbe, F.—Letters of Fanny Brawne to Fanny Keats, 1820-24, preface by M. B. Forman *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1937. Pp. xxii + 103 \$3.00

Gold, M. B.—Swift's Marriage to Stella. *Cambridge*: Harvard U. Press, 1937. Pp. xi + 189

McGarry, Sister Loretta. — The Holy Eucharist in M. E homiletic and devotional verse Catholic Univ diss, 1936. Pp. xx + 283.

Mersand, J. — Chaucer's Romance vocab. *Brooklyn, N. Y*: The Comet Press, 1937. Pp xiv + 173.

Mills, L. J.—One Soul in Bodies Twain, friendship in Tudor lit. and Stuart drama *Bloomington, Ind.*: Principia Press, 1937. Pp. x + 470.

Neal, John.—American Writers (from Blackwood's Magazine, 1824-5), ed. F. L. Pattee. *Durham*: Duke Univ. Press, 1937. Pp. viii + 261. \$3.00.

Parry, J. J.—Brut y Brenhinedd, ed. and trans *Cambridge, Mass*: Mediaeval Acad., 1937. Pp xviii + 250 \$6 00

Pearson, H.—The Swan of Lichfield, Selection from Corresp of Anne Seward *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1937. Pp. 316 \$3 50

Schelling, F. E. — Shakespeare biography and other papers chiefly Elizabethan. *Philadelphia*. U. of Pa. Press, 1937. Pp. 143. \$1.50.

Shakespeare.—Titus Andronicus, the First Quarto, 1594, ed J. Q. Adams. *New York*: Scribner's, 1936. Pp. 41 + facsimile of play. (Folger Shakespeare Libr. Pubs.)

Wordsworth, Wm. and Dorothy.—Letters, ed E de Selincourt. 2 v. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [N Y: Oxford Press], 1937. Pp. xxxii + 938 \$14 00

GERMAN

Apt, Alce.—Caroline und die Frühromantische Gesellschaft Diss Königsberg. *Dresden*: Germania Buchdruckerei, 1936. 95 pp.

Asch, Otto.—Bildsprache und Humor als Ausdruck geistiger Reife. Diss. Bonn. *Würzburg*: Triltsch, 1937. 149 pp. M. 4.

Bauer, Georg-Karl. — Sternkunde und Sterndeutung der Deutschen im 9.-14. Jh. unter Ausschluss der reinen Fachwissenschaft [Germanische Studien. H. 186]. *Berlin*. Ebering, 1937. 182 pp. M 7.20

Beranek, Franz J.—Die Mundart von Sudmähren (Lautlehre) Mit einer Grundkarte und drei Pausen [Beiträge zur Kenntnis sudetendeutscher Mundarten. 7]. *Reichenberg*: Kraus, 1936. xiii, 298 pp. 4°. M. 5.

Bertelt, Elfriede.—Gewandschilderungen in der erzählenden hofischen Dichtung des 12. u. 13. Jahrhunderts Diss Münster. *Emsdetten v. W.*: Lechte, 1936

Birch, Elina.—Der biographische Roman in der neuen deutschen Dichtung Diss Heidelberg. *Brinkum-Bremen*: Hülje, 1936 51 pp.

Bodensohn, Heinz.—Die Festschilderungen in der mittelhochdeutschen Dichtung Diss. Frankfurt [Forschungen zur deutschen Sprache und Dichtung. H. 9]. *Münster*: Aschendorff, 1936. 104 pp. M. 3 90.

Borras, Kurt.—Hoffnung und Erinnerung als Struktur von Hardenbergs Welthaltung und deren Verhältnis zur Form. Diss Münster *Bochum-Langendreer*: Poppinghaus, 1936. v, 55 pp.

Clemen, Eberhard.—Der Stil der Kunstprosa bei Paul Ernst. Diss. *Greifswald*: Adler, 1936. xii, 110 pp.

Deutsche Mundarten. Niederdeutsch aus Kleinwusteritz, Kr Jerchow (Mark) Bearb. von Max Bathe. [Lautbibliothek Nr. 38]. *Berlin*: Institut für Lautforschung an der Univ.; *Leipzig*: Otto Harrassowitz, 1937. 31 pp M 1.50.

Duttel, Martha.—Ruckerts Verskunst Diss Würzburg. *Nürnberg*. Spindler, 1937. v, 68 pp. M 2.

Eckerle, Joseph. — Die Mundarten der Landschaft Freiburg im Breisgau. Diss. Freiburg 1933. [Bausteine zur Volkskunde u. Religionswissenschaft H. 14]. *Bühl*: Konkordia, 1936 xvii, 73 pp. M. 3.

Eckert, Karla.—Das Bildnis der klassizistisch-romantischen Epoche in Deutschland. Diss Königsberg. *Koslin*: Hendess, 1936. 95 pp. M. 4.

Freitag, Karl Emil.—Hermann Stehr Gehalt und Gestalt seiner Dichtung. 1: Gehalt. Diss. Groningen: Wolters, 1936. viii, 322 pp.

Goethes Faust Herausgegeben von Georg Witkowski. Neunte, vielfach verb. Aufl. Erster, Zweiter Band. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1936. viii, 591; 590 pp. Fl. 6.50.

Grafe, Gerhard.—Die Gestalt des Literaten im Zeitalter des 19. Jahrhunderts. Diss. [Germanische Studien. H 185]. Berlin: Ebering, 1936. 136 pp. M 5.40

Gross, Hedwig.—Hartmanns Buchlein, dargestellt in seiner psychologischen, ethischen und theologischen Bezogenheit auf das Gesamtwerk des Dichters. Diss. Bonn. Würzburg. Tritsch, 1936. 80 pp. M 3.

Handschin, Charles.—Introduction to German Civilization. An Outline. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1937. 235 pp. \$1.25

Hechtie, Martha.—Walther von der Vogelweide. Studien zur Geschichte der Forschung. Diss. Köln [Deutsche Arbeiten d. Univ. Köln 11]. Jena: Diederichs [1937]. 75 pp. M 3.60

Heidegger, Martin.—Hölderlin und das Wesen der Dichtung [S-A aus Das Innere Reich, Dez. 1936]. München: Albert Langen [1937]. 16 pp. 60 Pf.

Hirt, Hermann.—Indogermanische Grammatik T 7. Syntax. 2 Die Lehre vom einfachen und zusammengesetzten Satz. [Indogerm. Bibl. Abt. 1, Reihe 1, Bd. 13, 7]. Heidelberg: Winter, 1937. xii, 271 pp. M. 12.50

Hovellmann, Werner.—Die Eingangsformel in germanischer Dichtung. Diss. Bonn Bochum-Langendreer: Poppinghaus, 1936. vii, 83 pp.

Howe, George M.—Elementary German. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1937. x, 164 pp. \$1.20.

Jahn, Gisela.—Studien zu Eichendorffs Prosa. Diss. Berlin. [Palaestra 206]. Leipzig: Mayer & Müller, 1937. x, 129 pp. M. 8.80.

Jannoch, Hans.—Die deutsch-tschechische Sprachgrenze am Fusse des Hohen Bohmerwaldes. Diss. Leipzig: Jordan & Gramberg, 1936. 99 pp.

Johansen, Niels Kaas.—Den dramatiske Teknik i Hans Sachs' Fastelavnsspil [Studier fra Sprog- og Oldtidsforskning, Nr. 174]. København: Poul Branner, 1937. 90 pp.

Keferstein, Georg.—Parzivals ethischer Weg. Ritterlicher Lebensstil im deutschen Hochmittelalter. [Literatur und Leben 10. Bd.]. Weimar: Bohlau, 1937. 106 pp. M. 3.60.

Koch, Heinz.—Paul Ernst und das tragische Herrscherideal. Versuch einer Deutung. Diss.

[Deutsches Werden H 8] Greifswald: Bamberg, 1937. 158 pp. M. 4.50.

Kolbenheyer, E. G.—Wie wurde der deutsche Roman Dichtung? [Reprint from. Zeitschrift für deutsche Bildung Jg 12, H. 10]. München: Albert Langen, 1937. 16 pp. 50 Pf.

Krisenjahre der Frühromantik Briefe aus dem Schlegelkreis, hrsg. von Josef Korner. Bd 1 Leipzig. Rohrer [1937]. xxiv, 667 pp. M. 42.

Kullmer, Erna.—Auffassung und Bedeutung des Todes im Werk Rainer Maria Rilkes. Diss. Münster. Bochum-Langendreer: Poppinghaus, 1936. 52 pp.

Langner, Eva.—Form- und Farbbeachtung und psychophysische Konstitution bei zeitgenössischen Dichtern. [Diss. Greifswald. S-A aus Zeitschrift für menschliche Vererbungs- u. Konstitutionslehre Bd 20, H 2]. Würzburg: Sturtz, 1936. Pp 93-147.

Liersch, Charlotte.—Motivgeschichtliche und stilistische Untersuchungen zur alemanischen Magdalenenlegende. Diss. Marburg: Friedrich, 1936. 55 pp.

Liessem, Thomas.—Wilh. Ostermann Leben und Wirken des rheinischen Volkslieders. Köln: Hofer [1937]. 127 pp., 7 plates. M. 3.50.

Ludendorff, Mathilde.—Lessings Geisteskampf und Lebensschicksal. München: Ludendorffs Verl. 1937. 235 pp. M. 3.50.

Mann, Thomas.—Mario und der Zauberer. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary by Waldo C. Peebles. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1937. xv, 144 pp.

Martinu, Kurt.—F. G. Klopstock im Raum der Nation. Diss. Bonn. Düsseldorf: Nolte, 1936. 170 pp.

Meyer, Paul.—Erinnerungen an Theodor Fontane 1819-1898. Aus dem Nachlaß seines Freundes und Testamentsvollstreckers Paul Meyer (Privatdruck von H[ans] St[ernheim]. Berlin W. 15: Pariserstr. 27. 62 pp. 4°.

Nagel, Ernst.—Johann Wilhelm Simler als Dichter. Diss. Zürich. Uster. Weilenmann, 1936. 87 pp.

Neumann, Wilhelm.—Die Totenklage in der erzählenden deutschen Dichtung des 13. Jahrhunderts. Diss. Münster. Emsdetten: Lechte, 1936. 99 pp.

Paul, Hermann.—Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte. 5 Aufl. Unveränderter Abdruck. Halle: Niemeyer, 1937. xiv, 428 pp. M. 12.

Pfützenreuter, Wilhelm.—Herzog Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig und der norddeutsche Späthumanismus. Diss. Münster. Dülmen, Westf.: Laumann, 1936. 72 pp.

Rheinländer-Mohl, Annemarie.—Umbruch des Geistes in seiner Auswirkung auf die

literarische Situation der Gegenwart. Nachgewiesen an der zeitbedingten und artfremden Romankunst Franz Werfels. Diss. Münster. *Bochum-Langendreer*. Poppinghaus, 1936 v, 74 pp

Rheinlander-Schmitt, Hildegard. — Dekaden und ihre Überwindung bei Hugo von Hofmannsthal. Diss. Münster. Heisterkamp, 1936 97, iv typewritten pages.

Rothe, Johannes. — Der Ritterspiegel [Altdeutsche Textbibliothek Nr 38] Halle: Niemeyer, 1936 xxii, 122 pp M 3 20

Ruprecht, Karl. — Wilhelm Heinrich Riehls "Kulturgeschichtliche Novellen" mit Berücksichtigung ihres Verhältnisses zur Quelle. Diss. Königsberg. Escher, 1936 77 pp

Sethur, Frederick S. — Deutsches Lesebuch Edited with Preface, Notes, and Vocabulary New York Prentice-Hall, Inc, 1937. ix, 226 pp \$1 60

Steindecker, Werner. — Studien zum Motiv des einsamen Menschen bei Novalis und Tieck [Sprache u Kultur der german u roman Volker Reihe B, Bd 19] Breslau: Priebebsch, 1937 vii, 81 pp. M. 3.60

Strasser, Rudolf. — Stilprobleme in Goethes Kunst und Dichtung. Diss. Heidelberg. Berlin: Brandenb Buchdr u. Verlags-Anstalt, 1936 62 pp

Trupp, Heinz. — Die Personennamen des Gladbacher Urkundenbuches bis zum Jahre 1600. Diss. Bonn. Essen: Trupp, 1936. vi, 120 pp

Weber, Alfons. — Studien zur Abwandlung der hofischen Ethik in der Spruchdichtung des 13 Jahrhunderts. Diss. Bonn. Würzburg: Triltsch, 1936 118 pp.

Weirich, Rolf. — Schillers Auffassung von der Kunst als einer erziehenden Macht und ihre Bedeutung für die französische Literatur des 19 u 20 Jahrhunderts. Diss. München. Würzburg: Mayr, 1936 130 pp.

Wingenroth, Sascha. — Clara Viebig und der Frauenroman des deutschen Naturalismus. Diss. Freiburg i. B. Endingen (Baden): Wild, 1936 109 pp

Witte, W. — Modern German Prose Usage. London. Methuen & Co [1937] xii, 167 pp.

FRENCH

Batiffol, L. — Ruchelieu et Corneille. La légende de la persécution de l'auteur du Cid. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1936. vi + 202 pp. Fr 15.

Brunot, F. — Hist de la langue fr. T. IX, la Révolution et l'Empire, 2me p, les événements, les institutions et la langue. Paris: Colin, 1937 xxviii + 660 pp Fr. 110.

Cavallucci, G. — Sur l'identité de Fatouville,

auteur dramatique du XVII^e siècle. Napoli: R. Pironti, [1936] 49 pp.

Celières, A. — V Cherbuliez. Diss. Paris: Droz, 1936. 578 pp

Choptrayanovitch, G. — Etienne Tabourot des Accords (1549-90). Dijon diss., 1935 227 pp

Corporon-Bédard, Y. — La vie provinciale dans l'œuvre de R. Boylesve. Toulouse diss., 1935 255 pp

Dedieu, J. — Les Philosophes du XVIII^e s. Paris: Hatier, 1936 606 pp Fr 16

Dickmann, Arnold. — Eustache Deschamps als Schilderer der Sitten seiner Zeit. Münster diss., 1935 viii + 187 pp

Elfert, Anna. — Die Dichtung der Louise Labé. Münster diss., 1935 65 pp

Flaubert. — Education sent., Mme Bovary, Salammbô, Tentation, Trois Contes, éd. E. Maynial. 6 v. Paris: Garnier, 1936. Fr 9 each

Frohock, W. M. — P. Lasserre, the evolution of his critical doctrines. Brown diss. Ann Arbor: Edwards, 1937 [lithoprinted]. vi + 106 + xv pp

Gambier, H. — Littérature française. Les trois grands siècles du moyen âge, XI^e, XII^e, XIII^e. Treviso: Longo e Zoppelli, 1936. 302 pp. L 25.

— Italie et renaissance poétique en France. La renaissance poétique en France au XVI^e siècle et l'influence de l'Italie. Padova: "Cedam," 1936 237 pp L 25

Godchot. — A. Rimbaud, ne varietur, 1856-71. Nice: l'Auteur, 1936. xii + 280 pp Fr 15

Guillemin, H. — Les visions, poème inachevé de Lamartine, éd. crit. Thèse comp. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1936. 255 pp.

Hugo, V. — Selected Poems, ed. A. Schinz. Revised ed. New York: Crofts, 1937 xxviii + 274 pp \$1 15.

Istrati, M. A. — V Cherbuliez et le cosmopolitisme. Diss. Paris: Droz, 1936 288 pp

Jakemes. — Le Roman du Castelain de Couci et de La Dame de Fayel, éd. établie à l'aide des notes de J. E. Matzke par M. Delboulle. Paris: Soc. des anciens textes fr., 1936. xevi + 309 pp.

Jeanne, E. — L'Image de la Pucelle d'Orléans dans la litt. hist. fr. depuis Voltaire. Paris diss., 1935 232 pp.

Kruglikoff, A. — Alphonse Daudet et la Provence. Diss. Paris: Jouve, 1936 320 pp.

Leib, Hildegard. — Le Cas des mésalliances dans le roman et le théâtre fr. au XVIII^e et au XIX^e s. Paris diss. (1935). 219 pp.

L'Ermite, P. — La Grande Amie, ed. Sister M. St. Francis. New York: Bruce, 1937. viii + 216 pp

Letsch, K.—"Francion" von Ch. Sorel u. das zeitgenössische Leben in Fr. Munster diss., 1936 viii + 69 pp.

Leyvaillant, M.—Deux Livres des Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe, éd crit Thèse comp 2 v. Paris: Delagrave, 1936 xii + 388 + 329 pp.

McAndrew, Allan.—Louis Hémon, sa vie et son œuvre. Diss. Paris: Jouve, 1936 256 pp

Mallarmé.—Some Poems of —, trans. Roger Fry, introd by Charles Mauron. New York: Oxford Press, 1937 xii + 308 pp \$3 00.

Mohna, J. S.—Sobre un plagio de La Rochefoucauld a Cervantes *Santiago de Chile*: Imp Universitaria, 1935.

Molnét, Jean.—Les Faictz et Dictz, éd Noël Dupire. Paris: Soc des anciens textes fr., 1936 421 pp.

Moreau, M. Abel.—René Bazin et son œuvre romanesque Dijon diss., 1934 221 pp.

Moret, M. M.—Le Sentiment relig chez G. Sand Diss. Paris: Vigné, 1936 290 pp

Pourrat, H.—Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der "litt. terrienne." Wurzburg diss., 1936. x + 107 pp

Prioult, A.—Balzac avant la Comédie humaine (1818-29) Diss. Paris: Jouve, 1936 xx + 484 pp.

—H de Balzac, Sténie. Diss *Ibid*, 1936 xxx + 256 pp.

Reese, Helen R.—La Mesnardière's *Poétique* (1639) sources and dramatic theories. Johns Hopkins diss *Baltimore*: J H Press, 1937 241 pp. \$1 25. (J H Studies, 28.)

Riegel, R. M.—Sainte's Beuve's Treatment of Romanticism Abstract of Ill diss. 9 pp.

Rivaille, L.—P. Corneille correcteur de ses œuvres, 1632-44. Thèse comp. Paris: (1936). 68 pp.

Sadlo, J.—Influences phonétiques fr. sur le langage des enfants polonais en Fr Strasbourg diss., 1935 152 pp.

Smith, Horatio.—Masters of French Literature. New York: Scribner's, 1937. xii + 338 pp

Silver, Mabel.—Jules Sandeau. Diss. Paris: 1936. 247 pp.

Stendhal.—La Chartreuse de Parme, ed A. P. Belmont. New York: Macmillan 1937. xxiv + 346 pp. \$1 50.

Vidier et Perrier.—Catalogue gén des ms fr. de la Bibl nat. 3 T. A-K. Paris: 1931-5. ii + 415 + 395 + 415 pp.

ITALIAN

Alfieri.—Agamennone, ed. D. Mattalia; Filippo, ed. G. Marzot; Palinici, ed. R. Ramat. 3 v. Firenze: Vallecchi, 1936 107

+ 168 + 165 pp. L. 4 + 4.50 + 4. (Bibl. di cl. ital.)

Alighieri, Dante.—La Divina Commedia, ed C. Steiner *Torino*: Paravia, 1936. xi + 1168 pp. L. 24 (Bibl di cl ital.)

Andreini, G.—La vita e l'opera di Carlo Roberto Dati *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1936 186 pp

Annuario del teatro italiano.—Anno II 1 giugno 1935-30 aprile 1936 *Roma*: Soc. ital autori e editori, 1936. vii + 481 pp

Antologia dei giovani scrittori e poeta italiani, ed N. Salvaneschi *Milano*: "900," ed moderna [1936]. 44 pp L. 12.

Baldacchini, S.—Purismo e romanticismo. A cura di E Cione *Bari*: Laterza e figli, 1936 xxxv + 229 pp. L. 16.

Bellusci, F.—Dante e "i due cognati." *Crotone*: Tip G. Calvo, 1935 30 pp

Bertacchi, G.—Il pensiero critico e le tragedie di Alessandro Manzoni, Parte I. *Milano*: Baldini e Castoldi, 1936 158 pp. L. 15.

Binni, W.—La poetica del decadentismo italiano. *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1936 viii + 153 pp L. 20

Boiardo.—Pagine scelte, 1434-94. Ed. A. Jozs. *Torino*: Paravia, 1936 125 pp L. 5.

Borriello, A.—La visione della morte in Giacomo Leopardi *Napoli*: A. Guida, 1936. 140 pp L. 6.

Bottighioni, G. and others — Sardegna romana *Roma*: Istit di studi romani, 1936. 137 pp. L. 10

Brandenburg, J.—Solomos et l'Italie. Leiden diss., 1935 128 pp.

Bruno, Giordano.—Le più belle pagine, scelte da L. Salvatorelli *Milano*: Flli Treves, 1936 viii + 225 pp L. 8

Calandrino, I.—Giosuè Carducci. Orazione commemorativa *Catania*. G Intelisano, 1935. 29 pp. L. 3

Calcaterra, C.—I lirici del Seicento e dell'Arcadia. A cura di —. *Milano-Roma*: Rizzoli, 1936. 959 pp.

Capasso, A.—Due saggi su G. Pascoli *Roma*: "Augustea," 1936. 213 pp. L. 10.

Carducci. — I trovatori e la cavalleria *Bologna*. Zanichelli, 1936 412 pp.

Caronna Agosta, G.—Poesie e prose Frammenti degli scritti inediti con prefazione di F. Aloisio. *Mazara*: Tip Grillo, 1935. 190 pp.

Carrara, E.—Tra il Furioso e la Gerusalemme liberata. *Torino*: F. Gili (lit.), 1936. 57 pp.

Chiarini, L. — Fascismo e letteratura. *Roma*: Ist. naz. fasc. di cultura, 1936. 49 pp. L. 5.

- Colli, L.—La musicalità e il colore nella Gerusalemme. *Napoli*: Tip. L. Di Lauro, 1936 19 pp.
- Coppola, G.—Cimossa carducciana. *Bologna*: Zanichelli, 1935. 117 pp L. 8
- Cortese, N.—Note alla "Storia della letteratura italiana" di F. De Sanctis. *Napoli*: "Siem," 1936. 61 pp.
- Costantino, D.—Smorfie e sorrisi Scritti critici, con prose e poesie di scrittori viventi. III. *Catania*: "Le pagine," 1935. 807 pp. L. 30.
- Cozzi, A.—La lirica italiana nella seconda metà del Cinquecento *Novara*: Tip S. Gaudenzio, 1936 86 pp. L. 7.
- Croce, G. C.—Bertoldo, Bertoldino e Cacasenno Con una prefazione di R. B. Crivelli. *Milano*: Ceschina, 1936. 413 pp.
- D'Ambra, L. — Romanzieri e novellieri d'Italia del secolo ventesimo I. *Roma*. "Le stanze del libro," 1936 233 pp. L. 8
- D'Azeglio, Massimo.—I miei ricordi Scelti e annotati da C. Calcaterra. *Torino*: Soc edit Internazionale, 1936 xix + 326 pp. L. 10.
- De Rubertis, A.—Studi sulla censura in Toscana Con documenti inediti *Pisa*: Nistri-Lischi, 1936 xvi + 445 pp. L. 18.
- Varietà storiche e lett con documenti inediti. Tassoni, Goldoni, Alfieri, etc. *Pisa*: Nistri-Lischi, 1935 513 pp L. 18
- De Sanctis, Fr.—Gli scrittori d'Italia, a cura di N Cortese III *Napoli*: Morano, 1935. 321 pp. L. 10.
- Saggi critici, ed P Arcari. 2 v. *Milano*: F.lli Treves, 1935. 312 + 332 pp
- Saggi e scritti crit. e vari, ed L. G. Tenconi. 4 v *Sesto S. Giovanni*: Barion, 1936. 462 + 419 + 431 + 444 pp
- Dolci, G.—Foscolo. *Messina*: Principato, 1936 370 pp. L. 20
- Elve, E.—Vocabolario italiano nomenclatore *Venezia*: G. Svizzero, 1936. 179 pp L. 3.50.
- Fazio, D. — Il Dux di Dante. *Roma*: "Aurora," 1936. 30 pp.
- Fiorentino, L. e Cordaro, G.—Petali e foglie. Antologia. *Catania*: G. Intelisano, 1935. 141 pp. L. 12.
- Flori, E.—Manzoni, Andrea Verga e i Grossi Da documenti inediti. *Milano*: "Famiglia Meneghina," 1936. 184 pp. L. 10.
- Fontana, L.—L'umanità e la poesia di Guido Gozzano. *Livorno*: Giusti, 1936. 97 pp L. 3
- Foscolo, Ugo.—I Sepolcri, le odi e i sonetti. Saggi delle Grazie e delle prose letterarie. Ed. G. Barone. *Milano*: Trevisini, 1936. 150 pp. L. 6.50.
- Galippi, A. — Amore di terra nostra. Spunti ed appunti letterari. *Vibo Valentia*: G. Passafaro, 1936 232 pp. L. 15.
- Gervasoni, G.—Leopardiana Leopardi filologo e poeta nei suoi rapporti con Angelo Mai. *Bergamo*: Ist. it. d'arti grafiche, 1936. 129 pp
- Giordano, V.—Commento estetico dei Promessi sposi *Francavilla Fontana*: B Zaccaria, 1936 128 pp.
- Giusti, G.—Poesie e prose scelte. Ed. U. Bosco. *Milano*: F. Vallardi, 1936 376 pp. (Bibl. di cl ital.)
- Ed E Ceria *Torino*: Soc edit. internaz., 1936 xii + 406 pp. L. 10.
- Gorini, C. A.—L'ultima poesia di Ada Negri. *Lodi*: Tip G. Biancardi, 1936. 27 pp.
- Grasselli, G.—Le relazioni e carteggio tra Antonio Cesari e Antonio Rosmini. *Reggio Emilia*. Tip. Guidetti, 1936. 101 pp. L. 5.
- Spunti critici su alcuni autori o libri dei tempi antichi e moderni *Reggio Emilia*: Guidetti, 1936. 137 pp L. 10.
- Gray, E. M.—Silvio Pellico. *Milano*: O. Zucchi, 1936. 109 pp L. 4.
- Guidetti, G.—Commemorazione di Antonio Cesari nel primo centenario della sua morte. *Reggio Emilia*: Tip. ed. Guidetti, 1936. 61 pp. L. 3.
- Gustarelli, A. — Personaggi dello Inferno (Purgatorio, Paradiso) dantesco. 3 v. *Milano*: Vallardi, 1936. 121 + 109 + 108 pp. L. 4 each.
- Lale-Démoz, M.—Cerlogne Sa vie, son œuvre. Thèse. *Aosta*: Marguerettaz, 1936. 126 pp
- Leopardi, G.—Canti e prose scelte, ed S. A. Nelli *Milano*: Hoepli, 1936 viii + 358 pp. L. 12.50.
- Limoncelli, M.—G Carducci *Lanciano*: Carabba, 1936 66 pp. L. 3
- Lipparini, G.—I grandi autori della letteratura italiana I Dante, Petrarca, Boccaccio, Ariosto e Tasso *Milano*: Signorelli, 1936 383 pp. L. 8.
- Lopreato, D.—Credere. Antologia della poesia italiana. *Sorrento*: G D'Onofrio, 1935 xi + 334 pp. L. 20.
- Lupis, F. — Ariosto sul lago Lemano. *Ferrara*. "Sate," 1936. 39 pp L. 465
- Maggi Maria, E. C. d'O —Esposizione della Divina Commedia II Purgatorio. *Roma*: A. E. R., 1936. 192 pp. L. 6
- Maggini, F.—Introduzione allo studio di Dante *Bari*: Laterza e figli, 1936 152 pp. L. 10.
- Mandalari, O. C.—Cinque poeti adolescenti di Calabria. *Roma*: Archivio storiografico dei reduci di guerra, 1936. vii + 70 pp. L. 10.

- Manzoni.**—*Liriche e la tragedia Adelchi.* Ed N Busetto *Torino*: Soc. edit Internaz, 1936. xxiv + 223 pp L. 7.50.
- *Liriche sacre e civili.* Ed A. Porciani *Milano*: Vallardi, 1936. 148 pp L. 4.
- *I promessi sposi.* Ed G Petronio. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C, 1936. xxiv + 627 pp. L. 12. (Bibl di cl ital)
- Ed G Previali *Milano*: Hoepli, 1936. 575 pp L. 10.
- Mariani, E.**—*Dove sono gli autografi di Dante?* *Napoli*: Tip. A Panaro, 1936. 10 pp. L. 5
- Marzot, G.**—*Alfieri tragico.* *Firenze*: Vallecchi, 1936 29 pp
- Mestica, E.**—*Dizionario della lingua italiana.* *Torino*: S Lattes, 1936 xv + 2098 pp.
- Moles, M.**—*Un pensatore poeta: Antonio Cappa.* *Napoli*: Studio di propaganda editoriale, 1936 128 pp. L. 3.
- Nadiani, P.**—*Un ospite di Dante. Guido Selvatico da Dovadola.* *Forlì*: Tip. operaia A. Raffaelli, 1936 23 pp
- Natali, G.**—*Carlo Goldoni e la commedia in Italia* *Roma*: Libr Castellani, 1936. 151 pp L. 16
- Orsini, N.**—*Bacone e Machiavelli* *Genova*: Degli Orfini, 1936. 211 pp L. 15.
- Paoli, V.**—*La Lucia dei "Promessi sposi" è un' oca?* *Massa Marittima*: Tip. C. Minucci, 1935. 37 pp. L. 1.
- Parducci, A.**—*Giosuè Carducci e Lucca.* *Lucca*: Scuola tip. Artigianelli, 1936. 19 pp.
- Pellico, Silvio.**—*Le mie prigioni e i XII capitoli aggiunti.* Ed. G Parini *Milano*: L. Trevisini, 1936. 246 pp. L. 8.
- Perrotti, M.**—*Note sulle liriche di Emilio Praga* *Napoli*: R Pironti, 1936. 29 pp.
- Petralla, G.**—*Poetica manzoniana* *Palermo*: "La Tradizione" (tip. M. Greco), 1935 155 pp L. 9.
- Pietrobono, L.**—*Saggi danteschi.* *Roma*: Scuola tip "Don Luigi Guanella," 1936. v + 378 pp. L. 20.
- Quintarelli, G.**—*Silvia Curtioni Verza e la vita mondana del suo tempo.* *Verona*: Comitato veronese della "Dante Alighieri," 1936. 22 pp. L. 10.
- Ragni, F. D.**—*Vincenzo Giusti, drammaturgo udinese del Cinquecento* *Udine*: Arti graf. friulane, 1936 136 pp.
- Reichenbach, G.**—*L'Orlando innamorato di Boiardo.* *Firenze*: "La nuova Italia," 1936 273 pp. L. 15.
- Rizzo, L. T.**—*La poesia di G. Leopardi.* *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1936. 213 pp. L. 12.
- Sala, G.**—*Carattere della cultura siciliana.* *Palermo*: "La Tradizione" (tip. M. Greco), 1935. 129 pp. L. 10.
- Santarelli, C.**—*Mazzini scrittore.* *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C, 1936. viii + 238 pp. L. 12.
- Scalfati, F. G.**—*Dizionario giuridico inglese-italiano* *Napoli*: Ed "La toga," 1936. 163 pp L. 12.
- Singleton, C. S.**—*Canti Carnascialeschi del Rinascimento* A cura di — *Bari*: G Laterza e figli, 1936. 498 pp L. 40 (Scrittori d'Italia)
- Solito, G.**—*Ippolito Nievo.* *Padova*: Tip del Seminario, 1936 vi + 314 pp.
- Spreafico, A.**—*La topografia dei "Promessi sposi" nel territorio di Lecco.* *Lecco*: Bartolozzi, 1936 125 pp L. 30.
- Tasso, Torquato**—*Aminta* Ed C Previtera *Milano*: Vallardi, 1936 120 pp. L. 6 (Biblioteca dei classici italiani annotati.)
- *Prose* Ed F Flora. *Milano-Roma*: Rizzoli, 1935 1016 pp.
- *Rinaldo* Ed L Bonfigli *Bari*: Laterza e figli, 1936 371 pp. L. 30
- Titone, V.**—*Giovanni Boccaccio.* *Bologna*: Cappelli, 1936. 183 pp L. 10
- *Storia politica e letteraria d'Italia. I L'età barocca* *Firenze*: "La nuova Italia," 1936. 197 pp L. 12
- Valgimigli, M.**—*Francesco De Sanctis.* *Padova*: "Cedam," 1936 34 pp L. 5.
- Valgimigli, M., Festa, N. and others.**—*Studi pascoliani. IV Un autografo di G Pascoli* *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1936. 111 pp
- Vannucci, P.**—*Carducci e gli Scolopi.* *Roma*: Signorelli, 1936 108 pp. L. 7.50.
- Verde, R.**—*Giovanni Verga, drammaturgo.* *Catania*: Tip Zuccarello e Izzì, 1936 133 pp L. 9.
- Vico, Giambattista**—*Il diritto universale.* Ed F Nicolini *Bari*: Laterza e figli, 1936. 3 vols. 840 pp. L. 100.
- Wartburg, W. von.**—*La posizione della lingua italiana nel mondo neolatino.* *Leipzig*: H Keller, 1936. 43 pp.
- Zama, P.**—*Persone e figure de "I promessi sposi"* *Faenza*: F.lli Lega, 1936. 58 pp. L. 3.
- Zambarelli, L.**—*Gli oppositori della fede di Dante.* *Vigevano*: Scuola tip Derelitti, 1935. 32 pp.
- Zecchini, A.**—*Un condiscipolo del Carducci: Don Natale Graziani.* *Faenza*: Tip. F.lli Lega, 1936. 31 pp. L. 3.
- Zibordi, G.**—*Carducci come io lo vidi.* *Milano*: Bietti, 1936. 311 pp. L. 10.
- Zotti, P.**—*Santo Francesco e Madonna Povertà. Il canto XI del Paradiso commentato.* *Benevento*: Tip. "Le forche caudine," 1936. 30 pp. L. 5.

SPANISH

Alemán, Mateo.—Guzmán de Alfarache. Ed Gili Gaya V. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1936. 212 pp 6 ptas. (Clásicos Castellanos, 114.)

Arauz, A.—Antología parcial de poetas andaluces (1920-1935) *Ódiz*: Edit Isla, 1936. 308 pp. 8 ptas.

Azorín.—Lope en silueta. *Madrid*: Cruz y Raya, 1935. 64 pp 3 ptas.

Bécquer, G. A.—Obras completas Prólogo de E. Gasco Contell. Introducción del autor. *Madrid*: Edit M Aguilar, 1934 757 pp. 25 ptas

Brentano, M. B.—Nature in the works of Fray Luis de Granada. *Washington*: Catholic U, 1936 xx + 160 pp

Belda, J.—Máiquez, actor, guerrillero y hombre de amor —Biografía *Madrid*: Edit. Nuestra Raza (s a) 189 pp 3 ptas

Carrillo de Sotomayor, Luis.—Poesías completas. Ed D Alonso *Madrid*: Edit. Signo, 1936 184 pp 3 50 ptas

Cervantes.—La Galathée Les Nouvelles exemplaires Ed Bardon *Paris*: Renaissance du livre, 1935 191 pp. Fr. 5 50.

Espronceda, José de.—Obras poéticas completas, ed J J Domenchina *Madrid*: Edit. Aguilar, 1936 838 pp.

Figueiredo, F. de.—Lope de Vega. Alguns elementos portugueses na sua obra *Santiago*: El Eco franciscano, 1936. 40 pp

Flores, A.—Lope de Vega. Versión del inglés por G de Torre. *Madrid*: La Nave, 1936 326 pp 11 50 ptas

García Figueras, T.—Lo africano en las comedias de Lope de Vega *Ceuta*: Imp África, 1935. 52 pp

Góngora.—Obras mayores. Las Soledades, ed D. Alonso *Madrid*: Cruz y Raya, 1936. 432 pp 12 ptas.

González Moreno, J.—Etimologías del español Esquema de un estudio diacrónico del vocabulario hispano-mexicano *México*: J. Porrúa e Hijos, 1936 x + 236 pp.

Gutiérrez Gamero, E.—Galdós y su obra. III. El teatro *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1935. 390 pp 7 ptas

Jarnés, B.—Doble agonía de Bécquer. Biografía. Introducción del autor *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1936 240 pp + láms. 5 ptas.

Jörder, O.—Die Formen des Sonetts bei Lope de Vega. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1936. xii + 372 pp. M 22 (ZRP., Heft 86.)

Juan de la Cruz, San.—Poesías completas, ed. Pedro Salinas *Madrid*: Edit. Signo, 1936. 140 pp. 3.50 ptas.

Kasten and Neale-Silva.—Lecturas mo-

dernas. *New York*: Harper, 1937. xii + 216 pp.

Kemp, A. B.—Three Autos sacramentales of 1590 *Toronto*: Univ Press, 1936. 134 pp

Lazarillo de Tormes.—Ed Carmen Castro. *Madrid*: Edit Signo, 1936. 146 pp 3 50 ptas

MacGillycuddy, G. V.—Pereda Studies or the Sea and the Fisherfolk in the works of P Würzburg: Mayr, 1936 102 pp.

Malaret, A.—Errores de Diccionario de *Madrid* *San Juan*, P. R.: Tip. San Juan, 1936 112 pp.

Matulka, Barbara.—The Feminist Theme in the Drama of the "Siglo de Oro" *New York*: Inst. of Fr Studies (s. a). 42 pp. \$1.00.

Pomès, Mathilde.—Poètes espagnols d'aujourd'hui *Paris*: Edit. Labor, 1934.

Primitiu, N.—El bilinguismo en Valencia. *Valencia*: Meliá, 1936 68 pp. 2 ptas

—La lengua valenciana a l'escola. *Valencia*: Cortell, 1936. 56 pp 1 50 ptas.

Rodríguez Marín, F.—Los 6,666 refranes de mi última rebusca, que con "Más de 21,000" y "12,600 refranes mas" suman largamente 40,000 refranes castellanos no contenidos en la copiosa colección del maestro Gonzalo Correas *Madrid*: C Bermejo, 1934. 198 pp 12 ptas.

Romero Flores, H. R.—Estudio psicológico sobre Lope de Vega *Madrid*: Acad Española, 1936. 225 pp 10 ptas

Santullano, L. A.—Jovellanos Biografía. *Madrid*: Edit. Aguilar 263 pp 6 ptas.

Sar, A. del.—Antología poética de la lengua castellana *Madrid*: Álvarez, 1935. 407 pp.

Scanlon, C. C. and C L.—Sp. conversation and comp *New York*: Harper, 1937. xiv + 236 pp

Schneider, M.—El colectivo en latín y las formas en "a" con valor aumentativo en español *Buenos Aires*: 1935. 71 pp.

Schug, H. L.—Latin Sources of Berceo's "Sacrificio de la Misa." *Nashville, Tenn.*: George Peabody College, 1936 112 pp.

Sedó Peris-Mencheta, J.—Catálogo bibliográfico de la Biblioteca Cervantina, reunida hasta el presente por D. . *Barcelona*: J. Bosch, 1935. 83 pp 15 ptas

Thomas, H.—Facsimile reprod with notes of Fray Ambrosio Montesino, Coplas (48 pp.) and of El Comendador Román, Coplas (64 pp.). *London*: Brit Museum, 1936.

Torner, E. M.—Temas folklóricos. Música y poesía *Madrid*: F. Fuentes, 1935 156 pp.

Torre, G. de, M. Pérez Ferrero, y E. Salazar y Chapela.—Almanaque literario 1935 *Madrid*: Edit. Plutarco, 1935. 297 pp. 10 ptas.

Vallvé, M.—Los siete Infantes de Lara. Leyenda del Romancero Castellano *Barcelona*: Edit. Araluce, 1935. 139 pp. 3 ptas.

Vega, Lope de.—Obras dramáticas escogidas, ed E Juliá Martínez. VI. *Madrid*: Hernando, 1936. xx + 420 pp. 4 ptas

Vindel, F.—Escudos y marcas tipográficas de los impresores en España durante el siglo XV (1485-1500) *Madrid*: Beltrán, 1935. 39 pp. 20 ptas

CATALAN

Aguiló y Fuster, M.—Diccionari Aguiló. VIII. *T-Z Barcelona*: Inst. d'Estudis Catalans, 1934. 302 pp

Amades, J.—Cançons populars amoroses i cavalleresques. *Tàrraga*: F Camps Calmet, 1935. 272 pp

—Refrany i dites. *Barcelona*: La Neotopia, 1935. 102 pp.

Artis, J.—Tres conferencias sobre teatre retrospectiu. *Barcelona*: Edit. Inst. del Teatre, 1933. 263 pp.

Avinyó, J.—Les obres autèntiques del Beat Ramon Lull. Repertori bibliogràfic. *Barcelona*: J Porter, 1935. 320 pp. 8 ptas.

Brunel, C.—Notice et extrait du manuscrit 1095 de la Bibliothèque de Marseille contenant des sermons catalans *Paris*: Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes, XCV, 1934. 80 pp.

Bulletí de Dialectologia Catalana.—Índexs Generals dels vint primers volums [1913-1932]. Vol XXI, any 1933. *Barcelona*: Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 1935. xii + 356 pp. 20 ptas.

Curet, F.—Teatres particulars a Barcelona en el segle XVIII. *Barcelona*: Institut del Teatre, 1935. 188 pp. 3 ptas.

Diccionari enciclopèdic de la llengua catalana.—III *Barcelona*: Edit. Salvat, 1935. 1030 pp. 61 ptas.

Forteza, G.—La irradiació estètica de l'obra Lulliana. *Mallorca*: Soler Prats, 1934. 39 pp

Griera, A.—Tresor de la Llengua, de les Tradicions i de la Cultura popular de Catalunya. *Barcelona*: Edic. Catalunya, 1935-1936. 4 vols. 342 + 328 + 320 + 302 pp.

Lull, R.—Llibre de Consolació d'Ermità. Ed. Margot Sponer. *Barcelona*: Bosch, 1935. 34 pp.

—Poesie et versetti, ed E. Mele *Rome*: Maglioni, 1935. 75 pp. L. 6.25.

Pagès, A.—Les poésies lyriques du "Décameron" catalan. *Toulouse*: Privat, 1934. 19 pp.

Riquer, M. de.—L'humanisme català (1388-1494). *Barcelona*: Edit. Barcino, 1934. 104 pp. 2 ptas.

Salto, O.—Les idees literaries de la Renaixença catalana. *Barcelona*: Edit. Barcino, 1934. 152 pp. 6 ptas.

Salvador, C.—Ortografia valenciana amb exercicis pràctics. *Valencia* "L'Estel," Quaderns d'Orientació Valenciana, [1934]. 77 pp.

Sant Jordi, Jordi de.—Poesías Piólogo de Martí de Riquer *Barcelona*. Libr. Catalonia, 1935. 85 pp. 0.75 ptas

Valentí, J. I.—Dues crisis en la vida de Ramon Lull. *Palma de Mallorca*: Edit La Nostra Terra, 1934. 20 pp.

PORTUGUESE

Nunes, L.—Crónica de Dom João de Castro. Edited with an Introduction by J. D. M. Ford *Cambridge, Mass*: Harvard University Press, 1936. xxviii + 242 pp. \$2.50.

Pedret Casado, P.—Algumhas normas pra unificazón do idioma galego *Santiago [de Compostela]*, "Nos" (s a), 13 pp (Seminário de Estudos Galegos)

Quental, A. de.—Cartas inéditas de — a Wilhelm Storek. Ed H Meier. *Coimbra*: Inst Alemão da Universidade, 1935. 23 pp

Vicente, Gil.—Auto chamado da Feyra. Editado por Marques Braga. *Lisboa*: Imp. Nacional, 1936. 58 pp.

GENERAL

Baldensperger, Magoun, Rollins, Viètor, etc.—Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Lit., XIX. *Cambridge*: Harvard U. Press, 1937. 299 pp.

Diego de Landa, Friar.—Yucatan before and after the conquest, trans with notes by Wm Gates. *Baltimore*: The Maya Soc., 1937. xvi + 162 pp. \$35.00.

Levi, E.—Introduzione allo studio della filologia romanza. Lezioni raccolte da M. L. Ruta *Napoli*: "Siem," Stab ind. ed. meridionali, 1936. 62 pp.

Mitchell, W. C., Dewey, J., Meinecke, F., Hazard, P., Jones, H. M., etc.—Authority and the Individual. *Cambridge*: Harvard U. Press, 1937. Pp. vii + 371. \$3.00. (Harvard Tercentenary Pubs)

Rehmann, A.—Die Geschichte der technischen Begriffe *fabrica* und *machina* in den romanischen Sprachen *Münster diss.*, 1935. 126 pp.

Rostovtzeff, Bédier, Gilson, etc.—Independence, Convergence, and Borrowing in Institutions, thought, and art *Cambridge*: Harvard U. Press, 1937. x + 272 pp.

Rusu, L.—Essai d'interprétation psych. de la poésie populaire roumaine. *Diss. Paris*: Alcan, 1935. 123 pp.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LII

JUNE, 1937

Number 6

IS THOMAS DE QUINCEY THE AUTHOR OF *THE LOVE-CHARM*?

Ever since J. Hogg reprinted *The Love-Charm, A Tale from the German of Ludwig Tieck*,¹ originally published in the *Quarterly Magazine*,² in *The Uncollected Writings of Thomas De Quincey*, it has been ascribed to the English Opium-Eater. Neither editors of his works like D. Masson nor research workers like W. A. Dunn³ nor W. Y. Durand⁴ doubted his authorship. The grounds for this ascription are twofold: (1) Hogg's assertion of a list checked in the archives of the *Quarterly Magazine*,⁵ (2) a passage in the memoirs of Charles Knight, the proprietor of the journal to which the anonymous translator had contributed. It was in 1864, almost forty years after the printing of *The Love-Charm*, that Knight pointed out: "He wrote a translation of the *The Love-Charm* of Tieck, with a notice of the author. This is not reprinted in his *Collected Works*, but perhaps it is the most interesting of his translations from the German."⁶

The occasion of the present article is the discovery of another version, almost identical with that hitherto assigned to De Quincey but lacking the "Note" appended to the rendering of the tale in Knight's journal. It is to be found in "*The Old Man of the Mountain; The Love Charm; and Pietro of Abano*, from the German of

¹ Reprinted by D. Masson in *The Collected Writings of Thomas De Quincey*, London, 1897, XII, 434-67.

² New Series I, London, 1825, 146-173.

³ *Thomas De Quincey's Relation to German Literature and Philosophy*, Strassburg diss., 1900

⁴ *PMLA.*, XII (1907), 521.

⁵ Masson, XII, p. xv

⁶ *Passages of a Working Life*, I, London, 1864, 339.

Tieck."⁷ E. H. Zeydel in his comprehensive survey, *Ludwig Tieck and England*,⁸ has attributed it to the Rev. Julius Hare, Archdeacon of Lewes and this ascription is borne out by Hare's peculiar spelling. The consistent replacing of "ed" by "t" after voiceless final sounds of verbal stems, which occurs in the version of 1831, is in accordance with Hare's spelling rules put forward in *The Philological Museum*.⁹ Moreover, the publisher of the second printing of the 1831 edition in 1860 refers to the translator's death. That fits in with the case, Hare having died in 1855. Consequently if we still maintain that De Quincey is the author of the version of 1825, we have to charge Rev. Julius Hare, at that time assistant tutor at Trinity College, Cambridge, with plagiarism. This charge appears impossible if we consider the following points:

1. In 1831 Hare had already established his reputation as a good translator of German literature, publishing a translation from Fouqué in 1820 and eight years later coöperating with his school-mate Thirlwall in the English rendering of Niebuhr's *Römische Geschichte*.

2. His knowledge of German language and literature was sound throughout, dating back as early as 1804-1805, when he paid his first visit to Germany.

3. He was an ecclesiastic and was ordained in 1826. His character is described to us by a contemporary as being marked by "a conscientious stickling for truth. . . . No one of his time was less of a copyist."¹⁰

4. De Quincey himself did not reproach him with plagiarism, nor did Charles Knight, though he knew Hare.¹¹

5. Hare, for his part, refers to De Quincey and calls his observations set down in *On Knocking at the Gate in Macbeth* "admirable."¹²

After these external arguments let us apply some internal tests, comparing the literary opinions as revealed in the "Note" with De

⁷ London, 1831, 2nd ed., 1860

⁸ Princeton, 1931, 154. "As Sarah Austin informs us in *Fragments from German Prose Writers*, the translations are by Julius Hare."

⁹ Cf. *Quarterly Review*, July, 1855, 7, 18.

¹⁰ *Quarterly Review*, July, 1855, 17 f.

¹¹ *Passages of a Working Life*, III, 64, 268.

¹² *Guesses at Truth*, 158, 191-2, 269. I quote from the edition of 1905.

Quincey's views and those which J. Hare expresses in *Guesses at Truth*.

Speaking of Tieck's "comic spirit" the anonymous author of the "Note" mentions "the humour arising from good humour, not as it often does from ill humour." A parallel offers itself in *Guesses at Truth*, p. 287, also 210. "Let your humour always be good humour, in both senses. If it comes of a bad humour, it is pretty sure not to belie its parentage." I have not come across a similar distinction in De Quincey's writings. The remarks on Tieck as a master of humour in "Note," 464, are surprisingly closely connected with a chapter on "Wit and Wisdom" in *Guesses at Truth*, 199-210. While the "Note" praises "the incarnation, so to say, of the principle of mirth, in Shakespeare and Cervantes . . .," *Guesses at Truth*, 205, refer to Cervantes and Shakespeare in a similar respect. Still more surprising, because of its direct allusion to Tieck, is another passage: "A similar union of the graver and lighter powers is found in several of Shakespeare's contemporaries, and in many others among the greatest poets of the modern world, . . . in Cervantes, . . . in Tieck" (p. 206). The same chapter reveals certain parallels in vocabulary. "Good humour" occurs once more (210); "elastic" as applied to Tieck's comic spirit¹³ has its parallel in the "elasticity of Shakespeare's heart" creating the figure of Falstaff and the persons of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (p. 205). "Masterly irony"¹⁴ appreciated in Tieck's writings and "keen . . . wit"¹⁵ attributed to Molière and others recall to one's mind "the keenest wit" and "the greatest master of irony since Plato."¹⁶ Both terms are intended to characterize Schleiermacher. It would be admittedly a little far-fetched to say that "the heavenly purity . . . of his [Tieck's] Genoveva" ("Note" 464) should remind one of "the pure heavenliness" of Christ's spirit.¹⁷

Apart from these resemblances the strange fact remains that De Quincey never speaks of Tieck anywhere but in the "Note." This reserved attitude appears more than strange if one thinks of the rather detailed account of Tieck's works and the extraordinarily high degree of admiration expressed in the "Note." "There

¹³ "Note" 464.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 466.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 464.

¹⁶ *Guesses at Truth*, 207

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 207.

was in Tieck's early works a promise and far more than the promise of the greatest dramatic poet whom Europe had seen since the day of Calderon . . . no one . . . can have more to teach us about him" [Shakespeare].¹⁸ The fact that De Quincey everywhere else, and even when he criticises German Shakespeare scholarship,¹⁹ ignores Tieck entirely, presents strange contrasts to that eulogy. But it is almost certain that he knew Tieck and in particular two of his tales collected in *Phantastus*, for the third volume of *Popular Tales and Romances of the Northern Nations* (London, 1823) comprises Tieck's *Auburn Egbert* and *Elfin Land* as well as De Quincey's *Fatal Marksman*, a translation from G. A. Apel's *Freischütz*.

Hare however recurs to Tieck in the passage already mentioned and in another (299) which curiously enough praises *Phantastus*, that is the very collection of which *The Love-Charm* forms a part. Further, almost the same tone of high esteem permeates the entire paragraph. A third reference to Tieck as being a friend of the philosopher Solger is to be found on page 50.

Less convincing are the references to Aeschylus and Boccaccio, common to both the "Note" and that particular chapter of *Guesses at Truth*. For the "Note" does not allude to them as masters of humour. Of greater value is the comparison of Novalis with spring which occurs in "Note," 464, as well as in *Guesses at Truth*, 237. The general tone pervading De Quincey's attitude towards the German romantic philosopher-poet is much more reserved and even critical.²⁰ The fact that Schleiermacher's name occurs in the "Note" as well as in *Guesses at Truth* and is twice mentioned in the meditation on "Wit and Wisdom," while missing in De Quincey's writings, makes Hare's authorship the more probable. Hare's interest in Schleiermacher might have been aroused or, at least, fostered and strengthened by his friendship with Connop Thirlwall, his former schoolmate at Charterhouse. The same year, 1825, in which the questionable translation of Tieck's *Liebeszauber* came forth marks Thirlwall's *A Critical Essay on the Gospel of St. Luke, a translation from the German of Schleiermacher*. Other German writers referred to in the "Note" such as Goethe, J. P.

¹⁸ "Note" 464, 465.

¹⁹ *Collected Writings*, ed. Masson, IV, 824-825; XI, 50.

²⁰ Cf *Works*, VIII, 346, 410 note.

Richter, Schelling, Steffens, Hegel, the Schlegels, do not allow us to draw any cogent conclusions. Either Hare and De Quincey agree on them in their judgments or refer to them nowhere else but in the "Note." Only in the case of Goethe and the Schlegels slight evidence could be given in favor of Hare. We have to remember De Quincey's attacks on Goethe in his notorious review of Carlyle's translation of *Wilhelm Meister* (1824). Is it probable that just one year later he would have called Goethe the first of German poets? ²¹ On the other hand, we have to consider that De Quincey was likely whimsically to exaggerate and alter his critical opinions, which in the case of Goethe he really did. In the case of the Schlegels the same momentary character of a good deal of his criticism should be borne in mind. In spite of his prevailing mockery at the Schlegels ²² a passage like "though there are several things of great poetical beauty in the works of the Schlegels, their fame, upon the whole, rests on a different basis," ²³ is not entirely inconsistent. Nevertheless it would fit in much more easily with Hare's attitude towards the Schlegels. ²⁴ Similarly the brief survey of such English literary celebrities as Wordsworth, Coleridge, Southey, Lamb, Landor and Scott, in "Note" 464, gives no clue to the authorship since both De Quincey and Hare praise the artistic achievements of the writers mentioned.

On the other hand we have to examine the points which conflict with the theory of Hare's authorship. De Quincey had undeniably written for *The Quarterly Magazine* before 1825, his contribution being *The Incognito, or Fritz Hum*, a translation from the German of Friedrich Schulze, *alias* Laun. There is no direct evidence that Hare was a contributor to this magazine. Neither does his full name nor do his initials appear. But too much emphasis must not be laid on this fact, as many articles were issued anonymously. At the same time we must note that Knight, though mentioning the name twice, does not refer to Hare as a contributor to his journal.

To sum up, apart from the five external criteria the evidence rests on the following similarities between the "Note" and *Guesses at Truth*:

²¹ Cf. "Note" 465.

²² Cf. among others a remark in 1824, II, 227; but in 1826, II, 160-2.

²³ "Note" 464.

²⁴ *Guesses at Truth*, 218, 399.

1. The esthetic conceptions of humor and irony in the "Note" and *Guesses at Truth* are in keeping with each other.

2. There are parallel references to Shakespeare, Cervantes, Novalis, Schleiermacher and Tieck, the two latter weighing most heavily, which cannot be traced in De Quincey's writings.

3. The remarks in the "Note" on Goethe and the Schlegels agree more closely with the appreciation of them as expressed in *Guesses at Truth* than with De Quincey's attitude as shown in his writings.

4. The three preceding criteria are supported by evidence based on identical or similar wording.

If we trust Knight's statement made almost forty years after the publication of the translation and the "Note" we must ignore the external and internal evidence against De Quincey and explain Hare's reprinting the translation as his own. If we agree with Zeydel and attribute the translation and the "Note" to Julius Hare, as seems to me inescapable, new light would be thrown on the mediating activities of this interesting personality as well as on Anglo-German literary interrelations in the first decades of the nineteenth century. For both his wide knowledge and his well balanced critical appreciation of German literature he deserves closer study. It would place the Archdeacon of Lewes, at that time the possessor of the most complete collection of the philosophical, theological and historical literature of Germany, among such recognized interpreters of German thought as Coleridge, Carlyle, De Quincey and Henry Crabb Robinson.

*Englisches Seminar,
University of Berlin*

HANS K. GALINSKY

"'Twill be thine another day"

In elucidating "Here, sweete, put up this, 'twill be thine another day" (*Love's Labour's Lost*, iv, i, 109), P. A. Daniel furnished four parallels, and concluded that the last five words meant "it will be of use to you; you will find the benefit of it hereafter."¹

¹ P. A. Daniel in *Athenaeum*, Oct. 13, 1883, p. 465. Daniel's four parallels, corrected to convenient editions, are as follows: Jonson, *Tale of a Tub* (1640), II, ii, in *Ben Jonson*, ed. C. H. Herford and P. Simpson

Daniel, however, found a difficulty in this interpretation, in that the Princess's words to Rosaline gave rise to an expectation with regard to a future use of Armado's letter that was left unfulfilled. H. C. Hart in disagreement with Daniel believed that "'it will be your turn another day' seems rather what the Princess means to say." He does not add to Daniel's parallels.²

Daniel's interpretation of the passage, however, is justified, and his difficulty resolved, by further parallels that I have found. Especially definitive for the meaning is the parallel in J. Clarke's *Phraseologia Puerilis* (1638) with its two accompanying Latin phrases interpreting the English expression. I quote from the edition of 1671, where the Latin and English expressions are given side by side under the commonplace heading "to obey":

Istius non poenitebit olim obsequi.— It will be your own another day,
majorum in voluntati subserviebat if you do as I say.³

(1925-), III, 29. "Let 'hun mend his manners then, and know his betters It's all I aske 'hun and 'twill be his owne, And's Masters too, another day"; T Middleton, *The Witch* (ante 1627), II, III, 21-3 in *The Works*, ed. A. H. Bullen (1885-6), v, 399 "Give him grace To have a quick hand and convey things cleanly! . . . 'Twill be his own another day"; J. Cooke, *Greene's Tu Quoque* (1614), ed. J. S. Farmer, Tudor Facsimile Texts (1913), sg K3. "Gart Wee'le be instructed by you. *Rash Well*, if you bee, it will be your owne another day", W. S., *The True Chronicle Historie of the Whole Life and Death of Thomas Lord Cromwell* (1602), III, 1, 31 in *The Shakespeare Apocrypha*, ed. C. F. T. Brooke (1929), p. 175: "Tom, or Maister Thomas, learne to make a Horse-shoove, it will be your owne another day."

² *Love's Labour's Lost*, ed. H. C. Hart, Arden Shakespeare (1906), p. 67 n. Editors in general have omitted comment on "'twill be thine another day," which does not occur again in Shakespeare, although a close parallel in idea may be quoted from *As You Like It*, v, ii, 10 "Consent with both that we may enjoy each other: It shall be to your good."

³ J. Clarke, *Phraseologia Puerilis* (ed. 4, 1671), p. 233. According to the title-page this edition has additions by W. R. It appears from Clarke's prefatory note that the Latin phrases used in his volume were those felt to be "elegant" in the course of extensive reading. Erasmus's *Colloquia Familiaria* is specifically mentioned. As regards his English phrases, Clarke has this to say: "Many witty, smart, and emphatical expressions, drop sometimes out of vulgar Mouths in familiar discourse, and daily in ordinary affairs, which a Scholar may make excellent use of; and it is pitty they should be lost, or not laid up where he may know where to finde them again, when he stands in need" (sg. A4b). The parallel to the Shakespeare passage quoted from Clarke is one of these "witty, smart, and emphatical expressions" which "drop sometimes out of vulgar Mouths."

Two parallels from John Ray's *English Proverbs* enable us to identify "Put up this, 'twill be thine another day" as a proverb.⁴ Ray's first proverb is, "Let him mend his manners, 't will be his own another day."⁵ His second reads, "Quick and nimble, 'twill be your own another day."⁶ The proverbial character of the expression accounts for the many literary parallels to be found:

Applie your learnyng and your elders obey, It will be your profit another day. (T. R., *Nice Wanton*, 1560, sg. C. ii) ⁷

But I haue a secret to tell you, that if you wil conceale, and follow my counsaile, it will bee for your good another day. (*The Wit of a Woman*, 1604, sg. E4.)⁸

Lisan (der) Ile attend them presently be a good seruant, Dorus.
Dametas. Twill be his owne another day, Madam. (John Day, *Isle of Guls* (1606), II i.)⁹

I'lle teach you ply your worke, and thanke me to, This paines will be your owne another day (*No-body, and Some-body* 1606, sg. E2b.)¹⁰

Let my sister go waste his revenue in tapers . . . 'twill be her own another day (G. Chapman, *Monsieur D'Olive*, 1606, v, 1, 229) ¹¹

'Tis better, being a woman; thou may'st do Things that may prosper better, and the fruit Be thy own another day (J. Shirley, *Cardinal*, 1652.)¹²

Trust us, and 'twill be your own another day (T. Shadwell, *A True Widow*, 1679, III, 1, sg. F2) ¹³

⁴ Twenty-five proverbs that occur in *LLL* and also in Lyly's *Euphues* or in Pettie's *Petite Pallace* are listed in my *Elizabethan Proverb Lore* (University of Michigan Publications, Language and Literature, II, 1926), p. 411.

⁵ J. Ray, *A Collection of English Proverbs* (ed. 2, 1678) in the section called "An alphabet of joculatory, nugatory and rustick proverbs," p. 76. Jonson has a form of this proverb very close to Ray's. See note 1 above.

⁶ *Ibid.*, in the section headed "Proverbs communicated by Mr. Andrew Paschall," p. 345.

⁷ Ed. J. S. Farmer, *Tudor Facsimile Texts* (1909).

⁸ Ed. J. S. Farmer, *Tudor Facsimile Texts* (1902).

⁹ In *The Plays of John Day*, ed. A. H. Bullen (1881), II, 31.

¹⁰ Ed. J. S. Farmer, *Tudor Facsimile Texts* (1911).

¹¹ In *The Plays and Poems of George Chapman. The Comedies*, ed. T. M. Parrott, p. 357.

¹² In *The Dramatic Works and Poems of James Shirley*, ed. W. Gifford and A. Dyce (1833), v, 336.

¹³ Further parallels which I printed in *Notes and Queries*, XI, I (1910),

An examination of the foregoing quotations and of the proverbs from Clarke and Ray reveals that the *benefit* and the *good* or the *profit* referred to in "'twill be thine another day" is contingent in each case upon a prior action recommended to the person addressed, which if performed will result in a future benefit. In the passage from Shakespeare Rosaline is told that if she "puts up this" she may expect something to follow that will be for her good another day.

Daniel's difficulty referred to arose from his acceptance of the literal interpretation of the verb phrase "put up." The literal meaning of these words is punningly glanced at, but the emphasis is upon the transferred sense "suffer patiently," or, in the modern idiom, "put up with (something)."¹⁴ With this interpretation Daniel's difficulty disappears. Rosaline puts up with Costard's confusion of the two letters, to benefit later. Because of Costard's mistake Biron's love for Rosaline is revealed to his fellow lords, and they resolve "to woo these girls of France and win them too."¹⁵

M. P. TILLEY

University of Michigan

164; and XI, VII (1913), 7, when I was of the opinion that Hart's interpretation was correct, are T. Dekker, *The Guls Horne-booke* (1607) vi, ed. Temple Classics (1928), p. 52: "Marry, when silver comes in, remember to pay treble their fare, and it will make your Flounder-catchers to send more thankes after you, when you doe not draw then when you doe; for they know, It will be their owne another daie", T. Dekker and ? J. Marston, *Saiiro-mastix* (1602), ed. H. Scherer, *Bang's Materialien* xx (1907), 58: "It is your owne another day"; T. Middleton, *A Mad World, My Masters* (1608), I, i, 181-7, in *The Works*, ed. A. H. Bullen (1885-6), III, 260: "Mot Be wisely temper'd, and learn this, my wench, Who gets th' opinion for a virtuous name May sin at pleasure, and ne'er think of shame *Cour.* Mother, I am too deep a scholar grown to learn my first rules now. *Mot.* 'Twill be thy own, I say no more"; J. Fletcher, *Wit Without Money*, III, 1 (1679), in *The Works of F. Beaumont and J. Fletcher*, ed. A. Glover and A. R. Waller, II, 167-8: "If it were minced, Luce, would do a great deal better . . . It will be your own one time or other."

¹⁴ Both literal and figurative meanings here alluded to are supported in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the *NED*, s. v. put, 53***n, and 53p

¹⁵ I wish to acknowledge valuable bibliographical assistance received from Mr. J. K. Yamagiwa, sub-editor of the Early Modern English Dictionary, in the preparation of this note

LYCIDAS AND THE TRANSLATION OF "MAY"

In his Latin translation of Spenser's *Shepherd's Calendar* Theodore Bathurst¹ calls Piers, the Protestant pastor of the "May" eclogue, "Lycidas." The name appears only in "May"; in "October" Piers becomes "Faustus." At first glance, a source for the name "Lycidas," common in the pastoral, deserves scant attention, but the facts in this connection are significant.

1. The similarity in tone of *Lycidas* and the religious eclogues in the *Shepherd's Calendar*, including "May," has long been recognized.²

2. In the *Animadversions upon the Remonstrants Defence*, 1641, four years after *Lycidas*, Milton quotes at length from a speech by Piers in the "May" eclogue as a climax to an attack on worldly gain as a motive for taking orders:

Let the novice learne first to renounce the world, and so give himselfe to God, and not therefore give himselfe to God, that hee may close the better with the World, like that false Shepheard *Palmode* in the Eclogue of *May*, under whom the Poet lively personates our Prelates, whose whole life is a recantation of their pastorall vow, and whose profession to forsake the World, as they use the matter, boggs them deeper into the world. Those our admired *Spencer* inveighs against, not without some presage of these reforming times.

The time was once, and may again returne
(For oft may happen that hath been beforen)
When Shepheards had none inheritance
Ne of land, nor fee in sufferance,
But what might arise of the bare sheep,
(Were it more or lesse) which they did keep.
Well ywis was it with Shepheards tho
Nought having, naught feared they to forgoe
For *Pan* himselfe was their inheritance
And little them served for their maintenance,
The Shepheards God so well them guided,
That of naught they were unprovided
Butter enough, honey, milk, and whay,

¹ "Matriculated sizar from Trinity, Easter 1602, B.A. from Pembroke, 1605-6; M.A. 1609; B.D. 1618. Fellow of Pembroke, 1608." (Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*.)

² This and the following point are presented in some detail by Herbert E. Cory, "Spenser, the School of the Fletchers, and Milton," *University of California Publications in Modern Philology*, II (1912), 358-60.

And their flock fleeces them to array.
 But tract of Time, and long prosperity
 (That nurse of vice, this of insolency)
 Lulled the Shepheards in such security
 That not content with loyall obeysance
 Some gan to gape for greedy governance,
 And match themselves with mighty potentates
 Lovers of Lordships, and troublers of States.
 Tho gan Shepheards Swaines to looke aloft
 And leave to live hard, and learne to lig soft.
 Tho under colour of Shepheards some while
 There crept in wolves full of fraud and guile
 That often devoured their owne Sheep,
 And often the Shepheard that did them keepe,
 This was the first source of shepheards sorrow
 That now nill be quit with bale, nor borrow.

By all this wee may conjecture, how little wee neede feare that the unguinding of our Prelates will prove the woodenning of our Priests³

3. Bathurst's Latin translation of the *Shepherd's Calendar* can be dated, on the evidence presented by Mr. Leicester Bradner,⁴ "not long after 1608." Three manuscript copies of the translation are described by Mr. Bradner, and a fourth, which seems to have escaped notice, may be found in Folger Library MS 2203.2. This manuscript, a commonplace book catalogued⁵ as probably in the hand of Francis Corbet, is dated about 1610-30. Venn's *Alumni Cantabrigienses* lists a Francis Corbett, of St. John's, who received his B. A. in 1622-3 and his M. A. in 1626, one year after Milton entered Cambridge. Milton's acquaintance with Bathurst's translation is not impossible, perhaps not improbable if one allows for his

³ *Animadversions upon the Remonstrants Defence* (London, 1641), pp 58-9.

⁴ "The Latin Translations of Spenser's *Shepherd's Calendar*," *Modern Philology*, xxxiii (1935), 21-6. Bathurst's work was not published till 1653, two years after his death.

⁵ There is no separate title-page for the *Shepherd's Calendar*, but on the verso of the folio preceding the translation is written "Kalendarium Pastorale, seu Spenceri Pastor, Romano indutus centunculo"; and at the top of each margin is written: "Authore Mro Batters." The pronunciation of the name of "Magister Batters" discloses an identity somewhat disguised in the spelling. Besides the *Kalendarium Pastorale*, the manuscript contains two Latin plays (*Melanthe* and *Cancer*), an English dialogue, *Band, Ruff, and Cuff*, and other pieces.

early and continued enthusiastic interest in Spenser and for his own Latin verse.

These coincidences at least are noteworthy: "May" and *Lycidas*, in part, have a common subject matter, Milton quotes approvingly from "May" in the *Animadversions*; the good shepherd of "May" is called "Lycidas," only in the "May" eclogue, in a Latin translation extant to-day in four manuscripts; the translator and probably the copyist of one manuscript were Cambridge men, of an earlier time than Milton.⁶

ERNEST, A. STRATHMANN

Pomona College

DID SPENSER STARVE?

Among the manuscripts of "Declared Accounts" preserved in the exchequer records at the Public Records Office (E. 351/543, fo. 40^r) is the following entry:

To Edwarde Spencer gent uppon a warrt. signed by Mr. Secretarie dated at Whitehall xxx^{mo} Decembris 1598 for bringinge lres. for her ma^{te} speciall service from Sir Thomas Norrys Lo President of Mounster viij li.

The "Edwarde Spencer gent." who brought letters from Sir Thomas Norrys was undoubtedly the poet. We know that Edmund Spenser carried letters from Norris to the Privy Council and to Sir Robert Cecil ("Mr. Secretarie") at that time. The letter to Cecil was endorsed as received 24 December.

The prompt payment for this service which is recorded in the "Declared Accounts" has an interesting bearing on the question "Did Spenser die in Poverty?" which has been ably discussed by Mr. Ray Heffner.¹ While the discovery of this record of payment to the poet of a considerable sum does not invalidate Mr. Heffner's

⁶The use of the name "Damon" for Cuddie in "February" and "August" (Cuddie becomes "Daphnis" in "October") seems to have no significance in connection with *Epitaphium Damonis*.

A fifth manuscript has come to my attention since this note was written: the Britwell copy, sold at Sotheby's in 1924 and now in the Library of Mr. Carl H. Pforzheimer, is listed by Dorothy F. Atkinson, *Edmund Spenser, A Bibliographical Supplement* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1937), p. 68.

¹MLN, XLVIII (1933), 221-226.

conclusion that the poet died in poverty,² it does seem to dispose permanently of the story that he died "for lake of bread."³ Eight pounds would keep a man for some time and Spenser only lived about two weeks after he received that amount. Many a yearly stipend was no more than that in Elizabeth's day. But on the other hand the relief of immediate distress is small comfort to a man who has just lost a considerable fortune which he has laboriously built up, and perhaps Spenser had lost manuscripts as well.

He did not die of want, but discouragement and grief probably added to the physical effects of exposure and hardship endured in a winter crossing from Ireland, if some disease such as would be certain to result from the congestion of refugees in the compound at Cork had not already seized upon him before he set out.⁴

JOSEPHINE WATERS BENNETT

Ohio State University

² The further suggestion "that he died from neglect and a broken heart from this neglect" is perhaps less tenable. The prompt payment of the messenger's fee by Cecil, and the prompt and generous aid sent by Essex, if we are to believe Ben Jonson, seem to point in the other direction.

³ The phrase is Ben Jonson's. The record of payment for the messenger service proves that Jonson was exaggerating but it does not discredit the whole story. Perhaps it even adds credibility to the further assertion that the poet refused the 20 pieces sent to him by the Earl of Essex, saying that "he was sorrie he had no time to spend them." He may have felt death approaching and he had enough to take care of his immediate necessities. In regard to the verses published by John Lane in 1621, which Mr. Heffner thinks constitute "the strongest support" for Jonson's story, I should like to suggest that they may prove no more than that Jonson told the same story of Spenser's death more than once. Lane could not have read the *Conversations* but he could have known Jonson, or some member of the Jonson circle, and the closeness of agreement between Drummond's version of Spenser's death and Lane's suggests that they had a common source in Ben.

⁴ The item in the "Declared Accounts" was pointed out to Mr. R. E. Bennett by Mr. Franklin B. Williams, to whom I wish to make acknowledgment for the discovery of it. Mr. Bennett turned his transcript of the item over to me as the Spenserian of the family, but I do not wish in any way to take credit for the discovery. On the other hand I believe that it will be of interest to all Spenser students, and therefore that it ought not to be suppressed for want of a sponsor.

NOTES ON *ENGLANDS PARNASSUS*

Englands Parnassus, a dictionary of verse quotations compiled by Robert Allot, was published in 1600. In its numerous pages the Elizabethan reader found an ample store of poetic beauties, and the modern student finds an abundance of problems. Mr. Charles Crawford, the persevering scholar who mastered this literary maze, cannot be praised too highly. His remarkable edition of *Englands Parnassus*¹ identifies the sources of 2,239 passages, and makes acute observations on the probable derivation of the remaining 111. The present article traces 37 of the 111 lost sheep, and throws light on some of the others. Incidentally, Crawford never saw one of the excessively rare copies of the 1600 edition containing Robert Allot's name. Most copies contain only the initials R. A., and students may be interested in the final home of one with the dedication signed in full. The two known exemplars were acquired by the late William Augustus White of Brooklyn, to whom they are credited in the *Short-Title Catalogue*. When his library was dispersed, one of the copies was given to the Harvard University Library.²

Unable to trace 25 quotations assigned to Gervase Markham, Crawford suggested that they might be found in Markham's rare translation, *Devoreux. Vertues teares*, 1597. An examination of the Bodleian copy substantiates the prophecy; all but one of the 25 passages are in *Devoreux*. The exception (*Parnassus* 1080) is signed not with Markham's name, but with the word *Idem*. Like a few other untraced passages with this vexing signature, this quotation has probably slipped out of its proper place, and should be ascribed to some other writer. The following table indicates the signature of *Devoreux* on which each *Parnassus* quotation is found.

<i>Parnassus</i>	7	D1	<i>Parnassus</i>	1207	H1v
	295	M2v		1214	H2
	302	I4v		1244	G1v
	336	H1v		1332	I2
	348	B1		1361	K3

¹ Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913. All citations in this article are by the quotation-numbers of this edition. Crawford's own annotated copy is now in the Folger Shakespeare Library at Washington, D. C.

² The unique variant described in the *Short-Title Catalogue* as Number 379.

<i>Parnassus</i> 514	C3 ^v	<i>Parnassus</i> 1370	C4
528	C3	1442	F3 ^v
680	I4	1443	F4
711	E4	1526	G4
749	H4 ^v	1675	K2
750	H4 ^v	2225	B1 ^v
751	H4 ^v	2244	B2

Allot has dropped two lines from the middle of 1244, and two from 1442. Quotations 749-751 are in reality a continuous passage, including a full page of text in *Devoreux*. Allot made many silly blunders in transcribing. Two lines of his text of Quotation 7 may be cited as an example:

Thou reasonlesse desire that makes men seeke
To kisse the same, whilest fire doth thee imbrace.

Allot has completely lost the fine Marlovian quality of the original through two errors in the second line. The original readings are: same] Sunne thee] them.

The passages assigned by Allot to the obscure poet Thomas Achelly remain a problem. Crawford traced one of the 13 quotations to Thomas Churchyard, and two to Thomas Lodge. He predicted that the remaining ten would be found in a book of Achelly's that he was unable to consult, *The outrageous and horrible tyrannie which a Spanishe gentlewoman named Violenta executed vpon her louer Didaco*, 1576. The unique copy in the Bodleian Library shows that Crawford was in error. Nor are the ten passages to be found in another book sometimes attributed to Achelly, *The Massacre of Money*, 1602.³ A hitherto unnoticed statement points clearly to a lost book written by Achelly about 1570. The unique copy of Achelly's prose devotional work, *The Key of Knowledge*, [1571 or 1572], is preserved in the Lambeth Palace Library, London. In the dedication to Lady Elizabeth Russell, Achelly mentions "your courteous & amiable acceptation of those fewe ragged verses, whiche aboute two yeares paste I presumed to tender vnto your discrete iudgement." Allot's quotations are presumably drawn from these lost "ragged verses." The excerpts are too brief to disclose whether the poem was written in couplets or stanzas, but they are

³ Achelly cannot have written this book. In *TLS*, Feb 21, 1935, I suggested Thomas Andrewe as the probable author.

ample to demonstrate the moralizing tone. One of the quotations (939) is a bit from Catullus of which the Elizabethans were fond.

Crawford was obliged to postulate a lost work as the source of the 13 quotations from John Weever. The book was discovered in 1924. It is *Faunus and Melliflora*, 1600, the unique copy of which is now in the Huntington Library at San Marino, California. Crawford pointed out several books from which Weever had drawn ideas; besides these books, *Faunus and Melliflora* shows some indebtedness to *Venus and Adonis*. In turn it influenced the W. N. who wrote *Barley-breake, Or, A Warning for Wantons*, 1607. The following table shows the signatures of *Faunus and Melliflora* on which the *Parnassus* passages are found:

<i>Parnassus</i>	38	C2 ^v	<i>Parnassus</i>	1567	F1
	65	E3 ^v		1754	D2
	74	B3		1774	C2
	75	B4		1835	B4
	102	C2		1868	C2 ^v
	973	D1 ^v		1949	I1
	1083	F2 ^v			

Allot made his usual errors in copying lines from Weever,⁴ but he did not omit lines nor introduce serious mutilations.

Faunus and Melliflora also clears up one or two points in Robert Tofte's translation of *The Blazon of Iealousie*, 1615. For the numerous poetical quotations in his annotations, Tofte drew heavily, without acknowledgment, on *Englands Parnassus*.⁵ Among Tofte's quotations is the following (p. 31):

Riuals in Loue will be suspitious quickly,
And through Conceit (not reason) straight grow sickly.

The first line is identical with *Parnassus* 1567, which has just been traced to *Faunus and Melliflora*. Weever's original text shows that the second line is of Tofte's own composition, added to round out a couplet. Tofte's habit of tinkering with his texts may be illus-

⁴ Three verbal variants deserve to be cited, since the Allot version distorts the sense: *Parnassus* 102.2 want on] women 973.5 staffe] scoffe guider] guiler.

⁵ See Dr. George Kahrl, "Robert Tofte's Annotations in *The Blazon of Iealousie*," *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, XVIII (1935), 47-67.

trated by another of his quotations, previously untraced. Tofte prints (p. 54):

LOVES greatest powerfull Force and Excellence,
Is to transforme the very Soule and Essence
Of the Louer into the thing belou'd,
For so by deepe Philosophy t'is prou'd.

In this instance Tofte drew directly on *Faunus and Melliflora*, where the passage appears in this form (sig. D2):

. . . [Loues] force, whose excellence
Is to transforme the verie soule and essence
Of the louer, into the thing beloued:
This heauenly loue (no doubt) yong *Faunus* moued.

In conclusion, Tofte's book suggests a further brief addition to Crawford's scholarship. The standard authority on the other chief poetical dictionary of the period, *Belvedere*, 1600, is Crawford's article in *Englische Studien*.⁶ The preface to *Belvedere* names "Henrie Locke Esquer" among the authors used in the dictionary. Crawford reported in his article that he had not identified any quotations from Lok.⁷ Among the annotations to *The Blazon of Iealousie* is a couplet (p. 3) copied from *Belvedere*. Tofte closely follows the *Belvedere* text, which is (p. 162):

Sad perturbations that affections guide,
Should not giue iudgement, till their cause be tride.

Searching for the ultimate source of this quotation because of its Tofte interest, I found it in Henry Lok's *Ecclesiastes*, 1597. Lok's text is as follows (p. 19):

Said perturbations (which affections guyde)
Should not giue iudgement where her cause is tryde.

It is quite probable that other lines from *Ecclesiastes* remain to be found in *Belvedere*.

FRANKLIN B. WILLIAMS, JR.

Harvard University

⁶ "Belvedere, or The Garden of the Muses," *Englische Studien*, XLIII (1910-1911), 198-228

⁷ See also Crawford's introduction to *Englands Parnassus*, pp. xv-xvi.

NOTE ON FLETCHER AND MASSINGER'S *LITTLE
FRENCH LAWYER*

La-Writ. . . . *I love a dire revenge:
Give me the man that will all others kill,
And last, himself.*

Clermont. . . . *You stole that resolution.*

La-Writ *I had it in a play, but that's all one:
I would see it done.*

(iv, iv, 12-16; Variorum, iv, ed. C. Brett)

The origin of La-Writ's words has not hitherto been discovered. Both Darley and Dyce recognize the existence of a direct quotation by placing lines 13 and 14 in quotes, though Darley makes no comment and Dyce in a note admits ignorance of the source. Cyril Brett seems to question the existence of any original.

The actual source of the "resolution" may be found in the anonymous *Tragedy of Nero*, III, 11, 83-85:

Nero. What may I easily doe? Kill thee or him.
How may I rid you all? *Where is the Man*
That will all others end and last himself?
(*A Collection of Old English Plays*, ed Bullen, 1)

Though the wording here is not quite the same, it is close enough for stage purposes and the quick wits of an Elizabethan audience.

The presence of this burlesqued passage in *The Little French Lawyer* surely indicates a certain popularity or, perhaps, notoriety in the case of the anonymous *Nero*; at least such a conclusion is generally drawn from other examples of the practice. This would seem further to disprove Bullen's statement, already questioned by H. P. Horne (*Nero*, Mermaid ed.) and later by Ernst Schmid (*Thomas May's Tragedy of Julia Agrippina*, etc., in *Materialien zur Kunde des alteren Englischen Dramas*, XLIII) that

the tragedy of Nero was the first and last attempt of some young student, steeped in classical learning and attracted by the strange fascination of the *Annals*,—of one who, failing to gain a hearing at first, never courted the breath of popularity again. . . .

The evidence of this quotation is further valuable as a means for setting a provisional date of composition for *The Tragedy of Nero*. On the title-page of the 1624 quarto the words "Newly Written" occur. This Horne argues means recently written, "that is in

1624." Bullen interprets these words to mean "written anew," and thinks they are used to distinguish this play from an earlier tragedy on Tiberius entitled, *The Tragedie of Claudius Tiberius Nero, Romes greatest Tyrant*, 1607. According to Mr. Brett, the consensus of critical opinion on the date of *The Little French Lawyer* places it between 1619 and May of 1622. These dates are arrived at mainly through internal evidence of collaboration with Massinger and the evidence of the acting list prefixed to the play; these dates, therefore, cannot be seriously questioned. These facts make it necessary to date *Nero* sometime before 1622, and, in order to allow the full effect of the burlesque to make itself felt, not much earlier than 1618.

G. BLAKEMORE EVANS

Ohio State University

JULIUS CAESAR AND ELYOT'S GOVERNOUR

When Caesar is on his way to the Senate-house, Artemidorus thrusts upon him the warning "That touches Caesar nearer" than Trebonius' suit; Caesar puts it aside with "What touches us ourself shall be last serv'd." The incident is a forcible illustration of the *hybris* that goes before a fall, and it has no authority in Plutarch. Here, when Artemidorus urged that "they be matters of great weight, and touch you nearly,"

Caesar took it of him, but could never read it, though he many times attempted it, for the number of people that did salute him but holding it still in his hand, keeping it to himself, went on withal into the Senate-house.

Sir Thomas Elyot, in discussing affability in rulers and the lack of it, describes Caesar's increasing arrogance and then tells the same anecdote in a version less subtle than Shakespeare's but with a similar motive. Caesar,

beinge radicate in pride, and neglecting to loke on that bil, not esteminge the persone that deliuered it, whiche perchance was but of a mean hauiour, continued his way to the Senate, where he incontinently was slaine by the said Brutus, and many mo of the Senate for that purpose appoynted. (*Governour*, II, v, p. 134 in Everyman ed.)

One cannot suppose that this item has been overlooked by the commentators, but I do not happen to have encountered it. While

some such version as Elyot's may have passed into a pre-Shakespearean play on Caesar, it may be observed that Professor Starnes has given some reason to think that Shakespeare was directly acquainted with Elyot's popular book (*University of Texas Studies in English*, 1927, pp. 112-32).

DOUGLAS BUSH

Harvard University

SCENERY FOR *THE INDIAN QUEEN*

Dryden implies in the prologue to *The Indian Emperor* (D. L. 1665) that he wrote that play to order. Especially, he explains that the scenes for it are old—those used in the preceding year in *The Indian Queen* (D. L. 1663/4). The scenery was indeed so elaborate and costly that the theatres were compelled to make as much use of it as possible. Thus Professor Allardyce Nicoll has shown several possible uses to which the prison and grotto, or cave, scenery of these plays was put in the years following the first production of *The Indian Emperor*.¹ He suggests that the management of Drury Lane was making use of this same scenery as late as 1690.

Though it may be somewhat questionable whether or not the management, poverty stricken as it frequently was, could make the elaborate scenes constructed in 1663/4 last until 1690, it is highly probable that it did make them last through the 1670's. This fact is in part substantiated by the ever recurring appearance of temple and cave scenes during these years. Besides those already pointed out by Nicoll, temple scenes, in all probability written for the same old scenery, appear in Dryden's *All for Love* (D. L. 1677); in his *Cleomenes* (D. L. 1692);² in Crowne's *The Destruction of*

¹ *A History of Restoration Drama* (revised edition), Cambridge, 1928, pp. 36-37. Nicoll believes that the prison scenery was later used in Settle's *Feminine Prelate* (D. L. 1679), in the same writer's *Fatal Love* (D. L. 1680), and in Harris's *The Mistakes* (D. L. 1690). The grotto, he believes, reappeared in D'Urfey's *Commonwealth of Women* (D. L. 1685), and in Lee's *Sophonisba* (D. L. 1675).

² I hardly believe the scene here, III, ii, was written for the same old set; but it is as convincing evidence as some of that cited by Nicoll, and it is barely possible that the old scenery could have lasted.

Jerusalem, Part I, (D. L. 1676/7); and in Lee's *Mithridates, King of Pontus* (D. L. 1677/8).

More to the point, however, and conclusive as proof of later use of the old scenery, is the cave scene in Dryden's *Tyrannic Love, or, The Royal Martyr* (D. L. 1669). Act IV opens with a scene marked "an Indian cave." Now, the entire play takes place in the camp of Maximin "under the walls of Aquileia"; hence the marking of the scene proved entirely baffling to Professor Saintsbury.³ Aquileia is nowhere near India or America. The explanation of the marking is to be found, of course, in the properties of the Drury Lane management, with which Dryden was perfectly familiar. He is simply calling for the old "Indian cave" set that he had used in *The Indian Queen* (III, 11), *The Indian Emperor* (II, 1), and possibly other plays—one of the most famous scenes in the properties of the company.

THOMAS B. STROUP

South Georgia Teachers College

"THE Milder SHADES OF PURGATORY"

Milton's sonnet to Lawes ends,

Dante shall give Fame leave to set thee higher
Then his *Casella*, whom he woo'd to sing,
Met in the milder shades of Purgatory.

Warton's note on the last line, "By *milder shades*, our author means, shades comparatively much less horrible than those which Dante describes in the *Inferno*," has become the conventional interpretation, Masson observing that "the shades of Purgatory are called 'milder' in comparison with those of the *Inferno*, from which the poet had just emerged when he met Casella." In the rough draft of the poem in Milton's hand in the Trinity College Manuscript of the minor poems, where Milton is revising his sonnet, not merely transcribing it, the last line reads first, "met in the mildest shades of Purgatory." The *st* of *mildest* is cancelled

³ Scott-Saintsbury edition, IV, i. Saintsbury's note runs as follows: "Considering that the camp is near Aquileia, and that the scene here is at once in or near the camp, 'Indian' here is rather puzzling. Magic and remote countries go well together; that is all that can be said."

If men would be somewhat wiser,
 Women would not flout.
 Prithee, why so stout?

A Foole he came so let him goe,
 As he came hither,
 The windes to Gotham freely blow,
 To carry thither,
 Two Fooles together.

G. F. SENSABAUGH

Stanford University

SOME EARLY VERSES BY CHESTERFIELD

Sidney L. Gulick, Jr, in his recent *Chesterfield Bibliography to 1800*,¹ writes "The Earl of Chesterfield published nothing under his signature." His tabulation of pieces in the preliminary checklist omits some early verses published over the signature of Stanhope.

Gratulatio Academiae Cantabrigiensis . . . , Cambridge, 1713, included forty-two Latin verses beginning as follows:

O ANNA, Europae dum Tu miserata laborem
 Bellonam mulces tumidam, effraenemque furorem.

These verses were published as by Philip. Dormer Stanhope, Aul. Trin. Filius Natu Max. Honoratiss. Dom. Stanhope Fili Comitis de Chesterfield.² On June 25, 1713, Stanhope wrote concerning them: "mine are some of the prettiest in the book; the Bonny made them for me."³ "Bonny" remains unidentified;⁴ it is well known, moreover, that Chesterfield later claimed to have been very familiar with the classics during his stay at Cambridge.

CORTELL HOLSAPPLE

The University of Texas

¹ *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, Chicago, 1935, xxix, 90.

² [Signature B.] My attention was called to this signature by Professor Griffith.

³ Dobree, Bonamy. *The Letters of Philip Dormer Stanhope*, London, 1932, II, 9

⁴ Shellabarger, Samuel: *Lord Chesterfield*, London, 1935, pp. 39-40. The Bonny may be Ambrose Bonwicke, the younger.

A CURIOUS BLUNDER IN SOME MODERN ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF KING ALFRED'S VERSION OF BEDE'S HISTORY

Having had occasion recently to consult several modern English translations of passages from King Alfred's version of Bede's History (assuming its authenticity), I have been surprised to discover how a palpable error in the rendering of a single word has obscured the significance of the lovely story which tells how Caedmon received the gift of song. When the man appeared to him in a dream and told him to sing something for him, Caedmon replied that he could not sing anything and for that very reason he had left the feast and come thither because he did not know how to sing anything. But he who was speaking with him said, "Nevertheless you can sing for me." The Old English here is *Hwæðre ðū meaht mē singan* (*mē* appearing in all MSS except Tanner). Dr. Thomas Miller, in his edition of Alfred's Bede (E. E. T. S. o. s. 95), translates "Yet you could sing" (omitting *me* from the Old English text).¹ According to this translation Caedmon *could* sing if he would only try, an interpretation which is based on an incorrect rendering of the word *meaht*. Stopford Brooke, in his *History of Early English Literature*, translates, "All the same, you have to sing for me," and Cook and Tinker have, "No matter, you are to sing for me." In Faust and Thompson's *Old English Poems* we find, "No matter, you must sing for me." James Dow McCallum, in *The Beginnings to 1500*, renders, "However you shall sing" omitting *me*. All of these translations attribute to *meaht* the unwarranted idea of obligation or compulsion, which would require in the original either *motan* or *sculan*. It is hard to see how translators could miss the obvious meaning of *meaht*, "you are able, you can."² The sentence is properly rendered by G. T. Flom in his *Introductory Old English Grammar*: "You have the ability to sing," but through the omis-

¹ In his Preface Dr. Miller says he made "a 'contamination' of texts founded on T., C., O., Ca., in the order of preference." But he follows Tanner here in omitting *me*, without at the same time noting that *me* appears in the three other manuscripts.

² See Bosworth-Toller under *magan*: 1. to be strong, efficacious, avail. 2. to be strong, be in good health. 3. to be able, may (because a thing is possible). No meaning of *must* or *have to* or *shall* is given.

sion of *me* he fails to give the proper interpretation to the whole passage.

In the Loeb Classical Library the Latin text, edited by Dr. John Edward King, reads, *Attamen, ait, mihi cantare habes*, which the editor incorrectly renders, "But yet thou hast to sing for me."⁸ Though in the post-Augustan period *habere* is sometimes used in the sense of "have to, be obliged to," the obvious meaning of Bede, correctly rendered by Alfred, is "you have the ability to, you can," analogous to the Greek $\epsilon\chi\omega$.

In the text of Alfred's translation, then, we should retain *me*, which is supported by the Latin *mihi* and by three MSS., and we should translate: "Nevertheless you *can* sing for *me*." The omission of the pronoun obscures the miraculous element, and the mistranslation of *meaht* gives a meaning far removed from the original. The heavenly visitor tells Caedmon, not that he *must*, or *has to*, or *shall*, or *could*, or *might*, but that he *can*. "You have the power to sing for *me*," he says, which brings out the idea of divine inspiration as presented by Bede with such simplicity and charm.

JOHN M. MCBRYDE

Tulane University

GAWAIN IN THE *SQUIRE'S TALE*

A passage in the Squire's Tale, familiar to every student of Chaucer, in describing the arrival of a strange knight upon a steed of brass at the Court of Cambuscan,¹ declares that his salutation was so perfect

That Gawayn, with his olde curteisye,
Though he were comen ayeyn out of Fairye,
Ne koude hym nat amende with a word.

Editors have commented appropriately on Gawain's reputation for courtesy and his adventures in the Otherworld, but seem unable to explain the implication that he was still there.² Professor Manly sensibly remarks: "Chaucer seems to think of him [Gawain] as

⁸ J. A. Giles (Bohn's Library) has, "However, you shall sing."

¹ *Canterbury Tales*, v, 91 ff.

² Ed. F. N. Robinson (Boston, 1934), 823. Ed. W. W. Skeat (Oxford, 1900), v, 374.

still living in the land of Faerye";³ but neither he nor anyone else, to my knowledge, has furnished chapter and verse for such a belief outside of Chaucer. Yet the tradition is fully set forth in at least two forms.

In the *Bataille Loquifer*, composed by Graindor de Brie about 1180,⁴ we read that three fays, one of them later identified as Morgue (Morgan le Fay), find Renouart, the gigantic hero of the Guillaume d'Orange cycle, sleeping on the shore; and one fay proposes carrying him away.⁵

"A Avalon, nostre cité vaillant. . .
Là soit o nous, s'il veut, tout son vivant,
Avoec Artus et avoeques Rollant,
Avoec Gavain, et avoeques Yvant."

The proposal is carried out, and Arthur receives the tidings of Renouart's arrival gladly. After a description of the riches of Avalon, the author recounts the combat between Renouart and the monster Kapalu,⁶ and the transformation of the latter into a man. Arthur announces to Renouart:⁷

"Je suis Artus, dont l'on a tant parlé,
Renoart frère; ce sont la gent faé,
Qui sont du siècle venus et trespasé.
Vez là Rollant ce vermeil coulouré,
Et c'est Gauvain à ce poile roé,
Et puis Ivain, un sien compaing privé;
Et cele bele au vis enluminé
Icele est Morgue ou tant a de biauté."

A similar story is told by the notorious notary of Liège, Jean d'Outremeuse, in his *Miroir des Histoires* some two hundred years later.⁸ He reports that Ogier the Dane in the year 896 was wrecked

³ *Canterbury Tales*, ed. J. M. Manly (New York, 1928), 599.

⁴ *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, xxii, 534. J. Runeberg, *Études sur la Geste Rainouart* (Helsingfors, 1905), 165 ff.

⁵ Le Roux de Lincy, *Livre des Légendes* (P., 1836), 248. On Avalon and Morgan cf. R. S. Loomis, *Celtic Myth and Arthurian Romance* (New York, 1927), 191-3.

⁶ On the Kapalu cf. *Beitrage zur Romanischen Philologie, Festgabe für G. Gröber* (Halle, 1899), 311 ff.; Runeberg, *op. cit.*, 167 ff.

⁷ Le Roux de Lincy, *op. cit.*, 256.

⁸ *Ly Myreur des Histors, Chronique de Jean d'Outremeuse*, ed. S. Bormans (Brussels, 1877), iv, 47 ff. The story of Ogier, Morgan, Arthur, and the Kapalu is also found without any mention of Gawain in late versions of

on an island nine days sail from Cyprus. There ensue a combat between the paladin and the Capalu, and the release of the latter from enchantment. Other beasts attack Ogier.

Ly roy Artus, qui astoit adont en castel Plaisans, et Gawain, son neveour, ont escuteit; si oient la tenchons et les cris de biestez; si sont monteiz à cheval et vinnent parmi l'isle, si com faeis; car li lis est tous faeis.

Ogier overthrows both. Morghe, summoned by her son Alberon, intervenes and invites Ogier to Castel Plaisant.

"Ilh n'y at nul homme que Artus, mon frere, et Gawain, mon neveour, et Alberon de Monmure, nous fis natureis. . . ." Ogier l'entent, si dist en bas que ch'est Morghe, puisque Artus est ses freres et que li castel est .i. lis faeis; "et suy ariveis en faerie. Puisque ensi est, Jhesus en soit loies."

Jean d'Outremeuse then describes the splendors and marvels of Castel Plaisant, and soberly and at length reconciles his fantastic narrative with the demands of orthodoxy. Morghe, we learn, acquired her magic arts from Merlin;⁹

et fist le castel Plaisant ou ilh habitoit, et oit delez li iii. tant sorlement. Artus, Gawain, Ogier, et Alberon. . . . Asseis rengoit jusqu'à tant que li pape defendit, sour paine de excommunication, que nuls n'estudiasit ingremanche, fut faite et chantée adont .i. ympne à comble pour gardeur des fantasiez, c'on appelle *Te lucis ante terminum*, car les feez rengoient adont mult publement.

The remainder of Ogier's adventures in the Isle of Avalon, though highly amusing, hardly concern us. Let us note first that the sentence last quoted is strongly reminiscent of the opening lines of the Wife of Bath's Tale. No one who has read much of d'Outremeuse, either in the *Miroir* or the Pseudo-Mandeville, can doubt that he, like Chaucer, is laughing slyly at the tradition that in the old days magic was more prevalent, elves more commonly seen, than of recent years, and at the notion that the Church was responsible for the change. Hamelius has amply demonstrated d'Outremeuse's anticlerical bent;¹⁰ his covert humor has yet to

Ogier le Danois. Cf. L. A. Paton, *Studies in the Fairy Mythology of Arthurian Romance* (Boston, 1903), 74 ff. Vêrard's edition of *Ogier* (P., c. 1498) is in the Morgan Library, N. Y. Probably there was a common source for Jean d'Outremeuse and the *Ogier* romance.

⁹ *Myreur des Histors*, ed. Bormans, IV, 56.

¹⁰ *Mandeville's Travels*, ed. P. Hamelius, II, EETS (L., 1923), 12.

be fully recognized. Far be it from me, however, to propose that his account of Ogier's adventures in Faerye inspired both the reference to Gawain in the Squire's Tale and the delicious opening of the Wife of Bath's Tale.

Indeed, Jean does not seem to have been Chaucer's source any more than the *Bataille Loquifer* was Jean's source. All three references to Gawain in Avalon seem to be drawn independently (through channels of transmission which we can only guess at) from a minstrel tradition which flourished especially in Sicily and the Mediterranean. Jean surely places Faerie in that region. The author of the *Bataille* declares that he used to recite his poem in Sicily:¹¹ "grant avoir en ot et recovra entor Secile, là où il conversa." Guillem Torrella, the Majorcan poet, gives a full description of his visit to Morgan's palace presumably in the isle of Sicily, and of his discovery of the wounded Arthur.¹² The *Bastard de Bouillon*, perhaps composed at Liège, like the *Miroir*,¹³ places Faerie beyond the Red Sea, and relates the adventures there of certain Crusaders, their meeting with Arthur and Morgue, and their entertainment in the sumptuous palace.¹⁴ Add the testimonies of Gervase of Tilbury and Caesarius von Heisterbach and of *Floriant and Florete*, and it becomes quite clear that it was in the Mediterranean regions that the legend of Arthur's living on in Avalon with Morgan le Fay was most firmly fixed and most highly elaborated. Quite probably it was the *conteurs* of the South who introduced Gawain beside his famous uncle and aunt in their palace in the Otherworld. And it was an echo of this tale which seems to have reached the ears of Chaucer.

ROGER SHERMAN LOOMIS

Columbia University

¹¹ *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, XXII, 534. Runeberg, *op. cit.*, 167 ff

¹² Mila y Fontanals, *Poetes Catalans* (P., 1876). On this Sicilian tradition cf. A. Graf, *Miti, Leggende, e Superstizioni* (Turin, 1893), II, 303; P. S. Barto, *Tannhauser and the Mountain of Venus* (N. Y., 1916), 11-16, 116-19; W. J. Entwistle, *Arthurian Legend in the Literatures of the Spanish Peninsula* (L., 1925), 186; E. G. Gardner, *Arthurian Legend in Italian Literature* (L., 1930), 12 ff.

¹³ *Mandeville's Travels*, ed. Hamelius, II, 12 f. I have been unable to learn what grounds Hamelius had for his derivation of the poems from Liège.

¹⁴ *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, XXV, 604-6.

THE MILLER'S HEAD

Editors of Chaucer's works have, so far as I am aware, passed by in dignified silence what is, perhaps, the Miller's most picturesque accomplishment:

Ther was no dore that he nolde heve of harre,
Or breke it at a rennyng with his heed. (*CT*, I [A], 550 f.)

Even if we make due allowance for the relative instability of many, but, surely, not all, fourteenth century doors, this is no mean feat, and we must wonder if commentators have felt the statement to be, if not an unwarranted exaggeration, at least something too individual to require annotation. As a matter of fact, there are at least four individuals known to fame who have had the cranial fortitude to afford an admiring world the sight of such spectacular performances.

The first of these is George H. Devol, monte-player extraordinary, whose career is best exemplified by the title of his autobiography: *Forty Years a Gambler on the Mississippi. . . . A Cabin Boy in 1839; Could Steal Cards and Cheat the Boys at Eleven; Stock a Deck at Fourteen; Bested Soldiers on the Rio Grande During the Mexican War; Won Hundreds of Thousands from Paymasters, Cotton Buyers, Defaulters, and Thieves; Fought more Rough-and-Tumble Fights than any Man in America, and was the Most Daring Gambler in the World.*¹ After the omission of irrelevant material the following passage tells the story:

In most all of the many fights that I have been engaged in, I made use of what I have called 'that old head of mine' I don't know (and I guess I never will while I'm alive) just how thick my old skull is; but I do know it must be pretty thick, or it would have been cracked many years ago, for I have been struck some terrible blows on my head with iron dray-pins, pokers, clubs, stone-coal, and bowlders, which would have split any man's skull wide open unless it was pretty thick. Doctors have often told me that my skull was nearly an inch in thickness over my forehead. . . .

I have had to do some hard butting in my early days, on account of the reputation I had made for my head.

I am now nearly sixty years of age, and have quit fighting, but I can to-day batter down any ordinary door or stave in a liquor barrel with 'that old head of mine.' . . .

¹ Second edition, New York, 1892; first published in 1887.

During the winter of '87 or '68 John Robinson's circus was showing in New Orleans, and they had with them a man by the name of William Carroll, whom they advertised as 'The man with the thick skull, or the great butter' He could out-butt anything in the show, except the elephant. . . .

[*A butting match, 'just once for fun,' was arranged between Carroll and Devol.*]

I did not strike my very best, for I was a little afraid of hurting the little fellow; but then he traveled on his head, so I thought I could give him a pretty good one. After we struck, Carroll walked up to me, laid his hand on my head, and said:

'Gentlemen, I have found my papa at last.'

He had the hardest head I ever ran against; and if he had been as heavy as I was, I can't say what the result would have been if we had come together in earnest.

Poor fellow! He is dead now, and I know of no other man with as hard a head, except it is myself. My old head is hard and thick, and maybe that is the reason I never had sense enough to save any money.²

A younger contemporary of Devol and Carroll was James Riley, known in San Francisco as King of the Hoodlums and, more significantly, Butt Riley. In Herbert Asbury's *The Barbary Coast*,³ we read of this hero:

. . . Riley always carried a set of brass knuckles, a hickory bludgeon, a slung shot, and a big knife, but he seldom used any of these weapons. He depended principally upon his head, which he claimed had the thickest skull in Christendom. His method of fighting was to rush his opponent and butt him in the stomach or on the point of the chin, a procedure which soon rendered an enemy *hors de combat*. When he led hoodlums in raids upon Chinese houses or slave dens, he always demolished the doors with his head, and when his men had captured a Chinaman, it was his pleasure to see how far he could butt the poor Celestial. He was eager to establish a record in this sport, and probably did so, for with a running start he once butted a Chinaman, weighing about a hundred and sixty pounds, ten feet. The King of the Hoodlums also commercialized his gift, splintering doors with his head for fifty cents or a dollar, depending upon the thickness of the planks. He abandoned this particular aspect of his career, however, after he had, on a five-dollar bet, butted a hole in a door constructed of heavy oaken timbers. For the first time in his life he had a headache, and it frightened him.

To come closer to our own day, *The New Yorker*⁴ gives an

² Pp. 267 ff. I am indebted to Herbert Asbury's *The French Quarter* (New York, 1936), pp. 210 ff, for an account of Devol.

³ New York, 1933, pp. 163 f. Once more I must give glad thanks to Mr. Asbury for his curious and antiquarian researches.

⁴ April 15, 1933, p. 19.

account of a well-known gymnasium and pugilistic training school, where amusement is provided in addition to exercise:

There is always an official clown at Stillman's, the current one being Beezy Thomas, a boy from the Congo who breaks doors and cracks walls with his head

It is, no doubt, a far cry from Robin the Miller to George Devol, William Carroll, James Riley and Beezy Thomas, but we may be sure that between the fourteenth and nineteenth centuries stretched a long, thick-set, line of heroes whose pachycephaly was exploited to stir the wonder and respect of their less gifted fellows.

B. J. WHITING

Harvard University

A NEW SOURCE FOR BALZAC'S *CONTES DROLATIQUES*

Pietro Toldo's exhaustive list of sources and near-sources for Balzac's *Contes drolatiques*, in his article *Rabelais et Honoré de Balzac*,¹ shows one lacuna which merits our attention. The erudite Pietro failed to note the very close resemblance between *le Dangier d'estre trop cocquebin*² and a tale (number 20) in the fifteenth century *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* entitled *Le Mari Médecin*. Both stories have to do with *naveté* regarding sex on the part of a young man and the difficulties it causes in his married life. The fifteenth century narrative centers attention upon a *lourdault champenois* who has been kept in ignorance of the facts of life by his well-intentioned parents so that he may not rush into wild adventures during his youth. Balzac's tale treats of a Chevalier de Montcontour, intended for the clergy and reared in strict innocence by priests, then suddenly summoned from the cloister to marry the fiancée of an older brother who has been slain in a duel. In each case, the author plays up the young fellow's lack of sophistication with decidedly comic intent. Toldo himself proves that Balzac was well acquainted with the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* and con-

¹ *Revue des Etudes rabelaisiennes*, III, p. 117-137. This study is by no means limited to Rabelais, but considers the question of sources for the *Contes drolatiques* in general

² Toldo discovers four possible sources for this piece, going as far afield as Poggio's *Facetiae* in search of material.

sciously employed it as a basis for various tales in the *Contes drolatiques*.³ Which makes the oversight with respect to *le Mari Médecin* all the more puzzling.

There are, of course, differences between the two narratives, including one of some importance. In *le Mari Médecin*, the bride is well informed upon the matters concerning which her husband remains ignorant, but still does nothing to relieve the situation; while Balzac vastly increases the element of probability in his plot by making both parties equally naïve. He may have drawn his cue for this from a comparison of the *Mari Médecin* with another of his sources, Béroalde de Verville's tale of the *cocquebins* in *le Moyen de parvenir*.⁴ The latter attributes the unsophistication entirely to the young wife, where traditionally it is more to be expected, and hence is of less value for comic effect. Balzac apparently blended the innocent-husband element from the *Nouvelles* with that of the innocent-wife in Verville.

In both works, the bridegroom finally gains enlightenment and the solution of his problems. In order to bring this about, the author of the *Mari Médecin* can think of nothing more extraordinary than to have his *lourdault* sent to the most available physician by a clever mother-in-law, but the nineteenth century novelist conducts the matter quite otherwise. He sets the two *cocquebins* to seeking information from a charming couple of old lovers who have just fallen out and are grumbling petulantly about each other, the dame d'Amboise calling monsieur de Braguelongne "Ce Hon! Hon! Hon!—barbe Molle, etc." and the monsieur in question muttering that his dame is a "Vieille Ha! Ha! Vieille Hon! Hon! Etc." The latter are naturally in an excellent frame of mind to receive the advances of the youngsters and the stage is set for one of the most brilliantly comic scenes in the pages of Balzac.

In *le Dangier d'estre trop cocquebin*, we discover a tale of delicate nuances, sparkling with wit and replete with such a charm of style that it must remain one of the outstanding examples of modern French prose. Its composer has resisted the great temptation

³ Especially *D'ung Justiciard qui ne se remembroyt les chouses*, which comes directly and almost completely from *la Médaille à revers*, number 1 of the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*. *Op. cit.*, pp. 132-3, 135-6

⁴ Cited by Toldo. Its influence upon Balzac's choice of a title for his piece is beyond question.

assailing all writers of sex stories, that of allowing the natural attractiveness to certain types of human curiosity of any handling of the "forbidden subject" to relax the author's attention to artistry of expression or human depth and breadth of treatment. On the other hand, the individual who composed *le Mari Médecin* has yielded to it, producing a narrative whose sole attraction lies in its risqué content, while, both in probability of plot and in grace of style, it falls considerably below mediocrity.

G. M. FESS

The University of Missouri

REVIEWS

Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity. By ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY and GEORGE BOAS. Baltimore. The Johns Hopkins Press, 1935. Pp. xvi + 482.

This is the first of four very important volumes, the second of which, *Primitivism in Mediæval Times*, is now in preparation. The method followed is that of a collection of typical texts, brief or longer passages as the case may be, in the original Greek or Latin, with English translations, for the most part new or carefully revised. It is in short a *source book* of ideas and, as such, should mark out a new method for the factual presentation of those concepts which have been particularly fruitful in the history of thought.

The passages cited are grouped in chapters dealing with different aspects of Primitivism or Anti-Primitivism and are explained by brief commentary given in a thoroughly objective manner. Thus we are far from the moralizing preachments which the subject has too often evoked in the past. The main body of the book is followed by two supplementary essays: one by W. F. Albright on Primitivism in Ancient Western Asia, the other by P.-E. Dumont on Primitivism in Indian Literature. The antiquity and the well-nigh universality of the primitivistic attitude, in one form or another, are thus effectively shown.

The authors make an important distinction between "Chronological Primitivism," a kind of philosophy of history, and "Cultural Primitivism," which expresses in picturesque terms "the discontent of the civilized with civilization" (p. 7). Moreover,

this study brings out clearly another most significant distinction expressed by the words "hard" and "soft" primitivism (p. 10). "Between the spirit of such a hard primitivism and the idyll of the Golden Age there is manifestly a profound opposition" (p. 11). The ideal of the "land flowing with milk and honey," where all is easy bliss, is one thing; the rough, hardy Scythians and Germans of antiquity who live a life of frugality, simplicity, and legendary virtue without comfort or luxury, is quite another. The authors comment: "The child of nature has probably, as our texts will show, more frequently been held up as a model by the ethical rigorists and the teachers of the wisdom of not-wanting than by the amoralists and antinomians or by those who found their ideal in insatiability" (p. 11). What an irony of destiny if Irving Babbitt should turn out to have been after all, when the verdict of history is rendered, only a "hard" primitivist without knowing it! As a matter of fact, in their eloquent thunderings against modern "degeneracy," their preaching of virtue, and their harking back to the "good old days," Babbitt and Rousseau were much more alike than has been thought.

Moreover, this book (and no doubt succeeding volumes will do so still more completely) makes it possible to understand the background out of which Rousseau came. As the writers observe, "even in the works of learned authors it is sometimes still possible to find indications of the supposition that primitivism was essentially a novelty in the seventeenth or the eighteenth centuries; and in the minds of the less learned the belief appears still widely to prevail that it was a queer paradox introduced chiefly by Rousseau—the fact being that it was then beginning to go (temporarily) out of fashion, and that Rousseau contributed something to bring about its obsolescence" (p. xi). How naive has been much of the discussion of this question on the part of many previous writers appears with overwhelming clearness from this calm, factual study. Even those moderns with "small Latin and less Greek" may at length see the extent to which Rousseau was rather continuing a tradition than making a new one.

"Tout abrégé sur un bon livre est un sot abrégé," says Montaigne. The chief purpose of this review is to call attention to a "bon livre." The matter and the discussion in this volume are too rich for brief summary in detail. The book and its forthcoming successors will speak for themselves.

GEORGE R. HAVENS

Ohio State University

Peter Sterry, Platonist and Puritan—1613-1672. A Biographical and Critical Study with Passages selected from his Writings.
By VIVIAN DE SOLA PINTO. Cambridge: The University Press; New York. The Macmillan Co., 1934. Pp. ix + 242. \$3.50.

Peter Sterry has, as Professor Pinto remarks, "been almost neglected by students of literature," and his writings have been accessible in few libraries. Yet he was a person of importance in his day, as intimate and chaplain first of Robert Brooke, Lord Greville, and afterwards of Cromwell, and an admired and influential preacher in a time when preaching was a potent influence and was often literature, he was by no means the least able or least interesting of the group of Platonists who were together at Emmanuel College in the 1630s; and in his editor's opinion (which is, I think, a little too enthusiastic) "he is a writer of an imaginative prose comparable only to that of the greatest masters of that great age of prose poetry." All students of the period will therefore welcome this scholarly volume in which Professor Pinto presents—largely from manuscript sources—Sterry's life and singularly attractive character, analyzes both his style and his doctrines, and gives extensive extracts from his published and unpublished writings.

In his selection of material for inclusion Professor Pinto has, he writes, "chosen those passages that are likely to appeal to the modern reader"; his "aim has been to exhibit not so much those aspects of Sterry's work that probably made the greatest impression on his contemporaries as those elements in it which appear to me to have the enduring and universal qualities of great literature." This statement of purposes demands some comment; for it exemplifies a not uncommon confusion of ideas about the functions of the literary historian, and especially about the *raisons d'être* of such a task as Professor Pinto has undertaken—that of making the work of an interesting but unknown or neglected writer available to contemporary readers. Those reasons are two: to enrich the sum of accessible writings which have the value of literature for our own generation, which can now be read with enjoyment of their aesthetic quality or with a sense of the pertinency of their content to the interests, the questionings, the inner life of our age; but also to enlarge our understanding of the interests, the thoughts, the tastes, the questionings, the inner life of men of a former age. To do the first is assuredly to render a useful service, but to leave the second undone is to neglect a not less essential part of the business of the historian of literature—and the more distinctive part of his business *quâ* historian. The feudal system is now dead; the political and social historian does not on that account omit to

investigate its theoretical bases, its actual operation, its economic and moral consequences. As little should the literary historian in editing an unfamiliar author limit his attention to "those passages that are likely to appeal to the modern reader" and disregard those aspects of his writing that "made the greatest impression on his contemporaries." These aspects may be precisely those in which his age differed from ours; and to treat them as inconsequential is to confuse the rôle of the anthologist with that of the historian—and often, also, to lose much even of the potential aesthetic value of the writings in question. For to those who possess any historical imagination—which is after all one of the sources of aesthetic enjoyment—the things which do not intrinsically "appeal to the modern reader" may have a special interest and charm because they do not, because of their very irrelevance to our ruling preoccupations or tastes. It is surely one of the functions of literary history to show us how various is the mind of man, how diverse the thoughts and the aspects of life and nature which it has been moved by—as well as to show us what is constant or recurrent throughout this diversity.

But in taking Professor Pinto's initial account of his aims as the text for these general observations, I do less than justice to his book as a whole. For his practice is much better than his program. He gives an excellent brief exposition of most (not quite all) of Sterry's characteristic ideas, and the selections exhibit the author's thought, as well as his style, as adequately, no doubt, as is possible in eighty pages. The ideas are in part those common to the seventeenth-century English Platonists. What, however, is distinctive of Sterry is his thoroughgoing cosmical determinism, approximating (as Professor Pinto notes) Spinoza's, and radically antithetic to Milton's fundamental conviction of the "freedom" of both God and man. The philosophic reader will regret that Professor Pinto did not have space in which to cite the *argument* of the *Discourse of the Freedom of the Will* more fully; for it exhibits, perhaps, better than any other English writing of the period, how strictly determinism was implied by the principles of the Platonistic tradition, and especially by the dialectic of the *Timaeus*. For Sterry, since God is by his essence rational and good, his goodness was (*contra* Milton) "a constraining goodness"; and since everything in the universe flows from or shadows forth the divine essence, everything was eternally predetermined by this logical necessity. From this conviction results, for Sterry, a serene optimism and an ecstatic sense of the divinity of all things in nature and man—this, nevertheless, combined with a fundamental otherworldliness. The most striking trait of Sterry's character was doubtless not unrelated to this distinguishing aspect of his philosophy. Living amongst bitter sectaries and in a time of civil war, and taking his part in the religious and political discussions of his age, he never-

theless preserved an extraordinary sweetness of spirit, and even his controversial writings are almost wholly free from passion or invective. In his life (as Professor Pinto's biography shows) and in his works he actually fulfilled his own injunction "Take heed of suffering thy *zeal* against the *evil* to be mingled and tempered with *bitterness* against the *person*" He was thus a figure of a type rare in his age, he takes a place beside Spinoza among the saints of philosophy, and the Preface (here printed in full) to the treatise *Of the Freedom of the Will* is a classic expression—in some respects more striking because more poetic than Spinoza's—of what that philosopher called the *amor intellectualis dei* and of the moral temper in which it could result.

ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY

The Johns Hopkins University

Pushkin. By ERNEST J. SIMMONS. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937. Pp. 485.

This volume is undoubtedly the most important biography of any Russian author that has appeared hitherto in the United States and it deserves the attention of all those who are interested in Russian Literature. It is frankly a biography and as such it gives far more information regarding the history and genesis of the various works of Pushkin than it does description of them or criticism of their merits.

The author tries to present a picture of the great Russian poet, the anniversary of whose untimely death all Russians both in the Soviet Union and abroad are commemorating at this time. The last years have seen a great interest in and study of Pushkin. We know to-day the names of nearly all his friends, both men and women, the way in which he passed his time, his opinions on nearly all conceivable subjects. We still cannot say that we understand him.

Pushkin was born into a society which was undergoing great changes. The closest friends of his youth, the most fashionable and the richest members of Russian society, were engaged in a revolutionary movement, the consequences of which none of them had ever considered seriously. The movement was crushed and Nicholas I, a man of a rigorous, reactionary and bureaucratic temperament, ascended the throne. What was the relationship of the poet to all this? Apparently the Decembrists never invited him to join their number. The relations between the Tsar, Count Benkendorf, and the poet were at least equivocal. What was the explanation?

During the early part of the volume, Dr. Simmons emphasizes the curious boyishness of Pushkin, even at the time when he was

already a famous poet. Apparently Pushkin seemed irresponsible even in a gay and irresponsible society and that society with its unmoral flirtations and its duels, its neglect of human life and its haughty contempt for inferiors, seems strange to us with our aversion to duelling, our cult of democracy, and our ever-ready Reno. It is hard to picture to us convincingly the young Pushkin, for there was something to him besides his wildness and his mad escapades. At the very same time, he was studying poetry seriously and producing some of his most mature and polished work.

Similarly during the reign of Nicholas I, it is hard to believe that the relations of the Tsar and the poet were almost entirely based on a deliberate desire of the monarch to bind with silken cords a person whom he sincerely distrusted. There was some mysterious, personal element in the relationship which cannot be wholly explained by the correspondence and interviews of both men and the official records. Of course, with the results of the Russian revolution known to us, this explanation of deliberate mystification and secret dislike is the most popular and the best documented. Yet it cannot be the whole truth. There was something else, which explained Pushkin's real admiration for the Tsar at times and the undoubted willingness of Nicholas to overlook many of Pushkin's actions, even while he had him humiliated in every way.

The answer lies undoubtedly in that boyishness which Dr. Simmons emphasizes in the earlier parts of the book and which was perhaps indicated by the Tsar, when he appointed the great poet a courtier among youths. The same quality caused the curious appeal which Pushkin made to his contemporaries, even when he aroused their hatred and their distrust. It is this side of his personality which Dr. Simmons draws least convincingly. We would also like to hear more of the relations between Pushkin and Mickiewicz and the circumstances that brought Pushkin to write his markedly patriotic and even chauvinistic poems in his later years.

In his account of the events leading up to the final duel, the author is at his best. It was evident to all the contemporaries of Pushkin that the Tsar and the aristocrats and the petty scribblers were all hurrying the poet along a fatal path. His most devoted friends by stupid moves and his bitterest enemies by clever ones worked toward the same result. Dr. Simmons portrays this drama excellently.

The strength of the book is to be found in its factual narration of the life of Pushkin, so that for the first time in English we are able to understand the sequence of events. The Introduction is especially fine, for it gives us in a few words the whole position of Pushkin in the stream of Russian literature. So too does the closing Epilogue summarize the ambiguity of the whole situation.

The work is a piece of careful and serious scholarship. It fills a real gap in our knowledge of Russian literature and Dr. Simmons

and the Harvard University Press are to be congratulated upon it. The weakness in it lies in the ever-futile task of rendering genius intelligible, and the genius of Pushkin is especially hard to explain. Aristocrat, poet, liberal, patriot, *enfant terrible*, he lived in a past society which was in spirit alien to our own. He was a free spirit in a regimented day and yet he was an object of suspicion as much to the critics of the regime as he was to the most slavish adherents. An aristocrat by birth, he insisted also on an individual acceptance of his poetic ability amid a society of social upstarts and despisers of intellectual pursuits. At the same time he despised intellectuals who were not gentlemen and aristocrats. The world of his day could admire but not understand him and perhaps Dr. Simmons has done all that is possible to explain him to us. At least he has given us an accurate and readable biography on a scale that has been hitherto lacking.

CLARENCE A. MANNING

Columbia University

Comedy in Germany in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century.

By BETSY AIKIN-SNEATH. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1936. \$2.50.

Miss Aikin-Sneath opens her treatise with a short chapter on the theories of laughter. Derisive laughter is accorded a fairly complete discussion but we receive, as usual, only a scanty treatment of the non-satirical type, or pure merriment.

The theories of comedy in Germany before Gottsched, as these may be observed in Roth, Chr. Weise, and Barthold Feind, show that independence of opinion existed prior to the reforms of the Leipsic dictator. Gottsched himself receives extremely careful treatment at Miss Aikin-Sneath's hands. She takes pains to show that his purpose was, indeed, patriotic and that his methods, more than anything else, were faulty. He desired a comedy which would be truly German in its appeal to the middle class who were to be bettered by a realistic, satirical type of comedy. Realism, he felt, demanded the use of prose and the observance of the rules; otherwise the illusion would be destroyed. J. E. Schlegel, on the other hand, emphasized pleasure rather than utility, and was not nearly so realistic as the Gottschedians. This accounts for his critical preference for verse in comedy. He also never relies on, or even calls on, authority as was the custom with the Leipsic group.

The discussion of the popular comedy of this period (*Haupt- und Staatsaktionen*, *Harlekinaden*, and *Nachspiele*) offers a *fortiori* proof that Gottsched's proposals could not find a welcome reception by a public whose tastes were far below his own. A stage in the hands of actors, *e. g.*, Stranitzky and von Kurz, was bound to present the type of play that the theater-going public desired.

The plays of the regular stage, on the contrary, were written largely to illustrate the rules laid down by the Gottschedians, and through satirical laughter tried to effect a process of self-correction. Even the writers of these liked to vary their output with an occasional comedy intended only to amuse the spectators. Early examples of satirical comedy are taken from Hunold 1704, Callenbach 1711-15, Picander, and König 1726. Although no further originals appeared until 1742, numerous translations filled this gap. In 1742 Borkenstein's *Bookesbeutel*, which showed very definite Gottschedian influence, was popular enough to call forth imitations.

In the forties regular comedy divided itself into: 1) Satires on character, *e. g.*, by J. E. Schlegel, Fuchs, Uhlich, Quistorp, and Mylius; 2) Satires on professions, practically all of which owe a debt to Molière, *e. g.*, Krüger's *Die Geistlichen auf dem Lande*, Quistorp's *Der Bock im Prozesse*, and Mylius' *Die Ärzte*, and, 3) Satires on social background, which generally emphasized the wholesomeness of the middle class. This last group also gives ample evidence that from the early forties, the Frenchman had become in Germany a subject suitable for satirical comedy, as he had been long before in England. In the main, these satires of the forties showed a sturdy sense of reality and a freedom from sentimentality. Exceptions were Gellert and, to a degree, Krüger and Ulrich.

Miss Aikin-Sneath devotes a goodly share of her extremely short conclusion to a prediction that with the advance of civilization, satirical comedy may be replaced by popular comedy. Certainly this prophesy is based on anything but a study of the subject in hand. Except for the last chapter, however, there is evident everywhere careful, critical analysis of a field which has been none too thoroughly ploughed in the past, and we are deeply indebted to the author for the enlightenment which her study brings to this period.

Only a few comments are in order regarding the mechanics of the book itself. The digraph ß should be normalized throughout to avoid such absurd divisions as *beis-senden* (p. 68). A very few misprints were noted, *e. g.*, 1793 for 1743 (p. 76); *Meiste* for *meiste* (p. 93); and *Amsteldam* for *Amsterdam* (p. 58).

CURTIS C. D. VAIL

The University of Buffalo

Harvard Tercentenary Publications: I. Factors Determining Human Behavior. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937. Pp. vii + 168. \$2.50.

Readers of this journal, who may be assumed to be on the whole neither psychologists, physiologists, philosophers, nor anthropolo-

gists, will probably be mainly interested in this book as indicative of a modern state of mind. That state of mind emphasizes the helplessness of the individual rather than his strength. Dr. E. R. Adrian tells us of the nervous system, "the chief factor which determines the range of our activities" (p. 4) and of the "one certain, though perhaps unattainable, method by which human behavior could be improved," namely "to breed men with larger brains" (p. 11); Dr. J. B. Collip, of the hormones which "play an essential rôle in the maintenance of normal bodily functions, both physical and mental" (p. 12)—the mental functions being apparently bodily; Dr. Jean Piaget gives us a genetic account of one of the main forms of scientific thinking—the idea of conservation, Dr. Jung, the Swiss psychoanalyst, the rôle of instinct in the formation of our psychic life; Dr. Janet, that of psychic strength and weakness; Dr. Carnap, that of logic, which is always critical, diagnostic, never therapeutic; President Lowell discusses an historical instance of how the method of trial and error, rather than that of long-term foresight and principle, has succeeded in building up a harmoniously operating government; Dr. Malinowski, the possibility of an objective science of culture—in the anthropological sense of that term—as deterministic as the physical sciences.

Now all these clear and interesting essays (the adjectives are less applicable to Jung's than to the others) are written by teachers or former teachers. They are all written by men who, whatever their special professional interests, expected people to read them and presumably be affected by them. They must have believed even that the result of reading and discussing them would have manifested itself in behavior. Yet none of them show more than indirect evidence of a feeling that one of the "factors determining human behavior" is the reading and study of books. In fact, though the volume was planned by educators, written by educators, published in honor of the 300th anniversary of the founding of an educational institution, education is the one factor which is conspicuously absent from its pages. It may be that whoever devised this volume took education for granted; it may be that its power will be discussed in other publications; but as far as this particular book is concerned, the reader has the distinct impression that it is simply one of those traditional things (like saying, "God bless you," after a sneeze) which survive on tolerance but which are not supposed to have causal efficacy.

This impression is derived not merely from the omission of education from the volume but from the essays themselves. It goes without saying that education could have little effect upon the size of the brain, the endocrine glands, or the great social forces which make up a culture. It is the very opposite of the method of trial and error. As for psychological strength and weakness, the psy-

chiatrist may be an educator in the sense that educators are healers, but he cannot be an educator in the sense that educators are teachers. Teaching is simply not his affair—I am not referring of course to “occupational therapy.”

It may be that our scholarship, our teaching, our arts, our religion, are impotent to determine our behavior. But if so, there is something paradoxical in publishing the fact. For what effect could such publication have on anyone? The fact is, of course, that no one whose talk about human behavior suggests the impotence of the human mind or accentuates its subordination to external forces, really takes his talk or its suggestions seriously. A few years ago when muscles and glands were all the rage in advanced philosophical circles, no one was more loquacious about the futility of ideas than the people who believed in it. We all act as if education, in the larger sense of the word, were of importance; most of us speak and write as if it were negligible. Is it not perhaps the time to raise the fundamental question of precisely what its efficacy is?

GEORGE BOAS

The Johns Hopkins University

Alliterative Poetry in Middle English: A Survey of the Traditions. By J. P. OAKDEN, with assistance from ELIZABETH R. INNES. Manchester University Press (English Series XXII). 1935. x + 403. 20 s.

The present volume, following the one of sub-title *Dialectal and Metrical Survey* (1930), concludes a task ambitiously planned—nothing less than a general account of alliterative poetry in mediaeval England. Dr. Oakden regrets that lack of space required the suppression of much material that he would have liked to include. The suppression is our loss, but we can readily pardon him. As it stands, the book required a staggering amount of work, and that work has been well done. The author does not evade difficulties, and his judgments are sensible, and, generally speaking, convincing. He is quick to detect loose thinking or the error in an argument. For any critic much digestion will have to precede objection.

In his first four chapters he has undertaken to give us a literary criticism of each outstanding poem that is nearly always informative and suggestive. These characterizations show the author's familiarity with previous scholarly comment, and, therefore, provide the reader with a résumé of opinion upon the particular poem, and a final judgment that is fair, because the author has explored

the heights and depths of criticism. Within these chapters the following very minor slips occur: the proper names Panton (p. 32) and Grattan (55) are misspelled.

Chap. 5, on the "Alliterative School" is packed with meat. In it are to be found discussions of the common authorship of a number of the poems; of the interrelationship of particular poems; of the political and social circumstances that evoked such a poetic flowering. It might be said that Dr. Oakden has not always succeeded in giving credit to those who have previously adduced parallel passages between two given poems. To cite one instance, to Dr. Menner should be credited prior publication of the parallel between *Wars of Alex.* 5297 and *Pur.* 1046. On p. 105 n¹ *PMLA.* should read *Mod. Phil.* Such *minimae culpa*e are, however, to be expected in a book whose compilation has demanded the ordering of such a vast amount of citation. I wish there were space to quote from Oakden's evaluation of the contribution which the allit. revival made to English letters. Outstanding, of course, was its fostering of allegory, witness *Pearl* and *Piers Plowman* (see also on *Gaw. JEGP.* 27, 1). The poets of the school showed themselves also masters of the art of describing in phrases that were vivid and sharply cut. Their fault was lack of style, seldom lack of the precise word.

Chaps. 6, 7, 8 treat of "Vocabulary." The greater part of all three is taken up with an evaluation of the heritage of compound words bequeathed by OE. to ME. verse. The author's researches confirm "the impression that *poetic* compounds are entirely absent from the non-alliterative writers" (166 n¹). Their presence, though in reduced numbers, in allit. poems, is "sufficient proof of continuity despite change" of the old allit. tradition. To his lists the following might have been added: from *Gaw. bent-felde* 1136, *spenne-fote* 2316, *stel-gere* 260; from *Pearl doel-dystresse* 337, *hyl-cote* (Emerson) 791; from *Erk. day-belle* 117. Chap. 8 (with collaboration of Miss Innes) is rich in content and richer in suggestion for more profitable study. To the synonyms for movement (183) should be added *helde*, *Erk.* 137, unless the words refer to the genuflection made to the altar on departure. Under "Archaisms" for *hersum*, *Gaw.* 932 "appropriate" is nearer to OE. sense than NED. "devout." *Mascle*, *Pearl* 726 could be added to the list of heraldic terms. Among ON. expressions, in which the *Gaw.*-poet is particularly rich, *ranke*, "go" occurs also in *Erk.* 139. On *Gaw.* 1634 cf. ON. *lata illa*, "express disapproval." On 315 a word is lacking at top of page. On 350 *wor3t*, *Pearl* 631 should be *wro3t*.

Long and careful lists of allit. expressions occur in chaps. 9, 10, 11. They cover Old and Middle English poetry, OE. prose, and the prose of the northern allit. writers. The author has found means of indicating whether a given phrase in early ME. allit.

verse or that of the Revival is to be found in OE, early ME. and the verse of *Lazamon*. In so Herculean a task minor omissions are bound to occur. Thus from *Gaw.* could be added *beten on . . . buskeȝ* 1437, *bulleȝ and bereȝ* 722, *acordeȝ . . . corenaunteȝ* 1408, *hasel and þe hazþorne* 744, *hede and þe hals* 1353, *tayl . . . toppyng* 191. *Erik.* 334 is wrongly ascribed to *Alex.* on p. 289.

The sub-title is wisely chosen. ME. allit. verse of the Revival was a thing of Tradition. To the last statement Oakden's lists of phrases bear eloquent witness. The evidence in his book shows that this poetry did not, like Euphuism, bear the exclusive impress of one dominant personality. It was not a form "floated" out of a rustic backwater by the prestige of a single writer (p. 264). It was native to Western soil. If Langland(?) and the *Gaw.*-poet helped somewhat to "popularize" it, it also probably popularized them (see J. R. Hulbert, *Mod. Phil.* 28, 422). It was a "going concern" before its most distinguished practisers penned any of it.

If its sudden efflorescence in the West appear surprising, we must remember that the same age saw the rise of a Chaucer, the general quickening of the intellectual life of England, and the growth of the vernacular in use and prestige throughout the country. The language had assimilated the great increase of words which contact with French and Scand. tongues had compelled it to digest, and preserved what old locutions its speakers fancied. Poets were now masters of an unusually copious and suggestive vocabulary, as Oakden says, richer in allit. than in non-allit. regions, which they used to the limit. They wrote, the best with distinction, the worst unhandily, but each in the language of his home and kinsfolk (Vol. I, 130).

But what of the writer of genius, one such as the *Gaw.*-poet who must have enjoyed exceptional advantages? Are we to think of him as writing in a form of the vernacular strange to cultivated ears? We have to remember that while there is a standard speech now, then there was none. Each important dialect had readers and auditors of both high and low degree, and the speech of London was still only a dialect, one among many. Those many must often have been heard in London streets. Certainly for a London public our author would have been by no means dependent on those born and bred within sound of Bow. In the metropolis Westerners, church and lay, functioned and administered, and in their off hours probably preferred Western to London verse. There certainly seems now no good evidence for believing that our poet could or would have written in any other speech than the one used. Moreover, he need not have been dependent upon London for his education. Schools and libraries existed in the West or N. West whence he could have come by learning. It would have been easily possible for a man so well-read to have written in the dialect of Ches. or S. Lancs. the legend of a London saint.

To an artist of such linguistic obstinacy the last word on Dr. Oakden's labours may fittingly be allowed:

3e 1wysse, . . here is wayth fayrest
pat I se3 þis seven 3ere in sesoun of wynter.

HENRY L. SAVAGE

Princeton University

The Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs. Compiled by WILLIAM GEORGE SMITH. With Introduction and Index by JANET E. HESELTINE. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1935. Pp. xxviii + 644. \$6.50.

This dictionary, the contents of which testify to a lifetime of devoted research, constitutes another valuable tool for students of English literature and folk-lore. Mrs. Heseltine's introduction, rich and readable, is, proverbially enough, *multum in parvo*. Like G. L. Apperson's *English Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases* (1929) the sayings are illustrated by examples arranged in chronological order and, as is inevitable, we find proverbs and, almost equally important, innumerable instances not noted by Apperson. A comparison of ten common proverbs, taken at random, shows: 122 examples in both collections of which 68 are in Apperson and 54 in Smith; only 14 are common to both collections, but among the 14 are the earliest instances of six of the sayings. Apperson's arrangement of proverbs under important words or subjects is, it must be admitted, far superior to the present method of alphabetizing under first words, regardless of importance, which gives a plethora of entries under *a, an, he, it, the, to* and so on. Even the full index is extremely difficult to use except in the case of proverbs which contain unusual words. Here one may express the hope that no large collection of proverbs will ever again be made which does not give running numbers to the proverbs. Such a method, by no means uncommon, would make reference and recourse vastly simpler, as the use of this index indicates clearly enough.

It would be possible for any one who had amassed collectanea of his own to point out omissions of sayings or of examples of sayings, some earlier than the earliest given. There is no need for this, however, as no collection of this sort can be complete, and the present one is very rich, the special attention given to Shakespeare being a noteworthy feature. However, had more attention been paid to minor pre-Shakespearian drama earlier dates could have been secured for many sayings. As a matter of fact readers are likely to be more disturbed by the fact of certain entries than by

the thought of omissions. Altogether too many foreign sayings, for which not more than one instance is noted, are included (see examples on pp. 73, 80, 95, 252, 259, 281, 391, 563), and this is especially true of the sayings taken from Herbert's *Outlandish Proverbs*, few of which appear in English literature outside the pages of the original collection. A number of queries naturally occur to the reader. Does Chaucer's "Sende the wise, and sey no thyng" mean "A wise head makes a close mouth" (p. 31), or his "Daunseth he myrue that is myrtheles" mean "All are not merry that dance lightly" (p. 35), or does his "stampen, as men doon after eles" have any connection with "As slippery as an eel" (p. 53), or does his "a fool can noght be still" and "fooles can not hold hir tunge" go under "Foolish tongues talk by the dozen" (p. 109), or does "Selde is the Friday al the wyke y-like" really go with the quotations given from Shakespeare (p. 113), or does the Reeve's "This whyte top wryteth myne olde yeres" suggest that "Grey (white) hairs are death's blossoms" (p. 127), or does the quotation from the *Boece* belong with the other passages (p. 137), or do the Host's words "Draweth no monkes moore unto youre in" imply that "Pigeons and priests make foul houses" (p. 357), or should "as an hors he snorteth in his sleep" be placed under "Routing like a hog" (pp. 374 f.)? "Who-so comyth late to his in, shall erly forthynke" does not seem to mean "Last make fast" (pp. 254 f.). These associations, which do not seem altogether justified, were doubtless prompted by an entirely laudable desire to furnish as early entries as possible. In a work which necessarily teems with dates it is inevitable that some should be suspect. Thus, we find Lyndsay's *Thrie Estatis* placed in 1602 (p. 50), *How the Goode Wif* in 1597 (p. 220) and ?1597 (p. 565), *Beowulf* in c. 1100 (p. 262), Scott's *Redgauntlet* in 1832 (p. 381), Latimer's *Sermon of the Plough* in 1648 (p. 428), Udall's *Erasmus's Apothegms* in 1564 (p. 463), *Hyckscorner* in c. 1543 (p. 469) and c. 1530 (p. 476), Daws's translation of Sleidanus's *Commentary* in 1506 (p. 526). *Lusty Juventus* is not found in Hazlitt's *E. P. P.* (p. 335), but in his edition of Dodsley's *Select Collection of Old Plays*. As a final quibble let us note that the introduction makes Wynfrith, "perhaps better known as Boniface" a "Northumbrian missionary" (p. viii). Slips such as these are few and far between and the book is a monument to arduous and painstaking labor on the part of both Mr. Smith and Mrs. Heseltine.

The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy. By WILLARD FARNHAM. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1936. Pp. xiv + 487. \$5.00.

In his opening chapter, Professor Farnham reviews the decline of tragedy in Greece, its existence on Roman soil, the growing conviction in Stoicism, Neo-Platonism and Gnosticism that "the world of the flesh, with all the striving of men therein, is a welter of unexplainable evil," and the development of the concept of Fortune. He then passes to "an account of tragic expression apart from the stage in the medieval Europe of established Gothic art, where Gothic form of presentation for tragedy commanded almost no benefit from the examples of classic form left by the Greco-Roman culture" (p. xi). Chapter II sets in relief the incongruity in the later Middle Ages between the *de contemptu mundi* mood and the Renaissance joy in life. A careful study of Boccaccio's *De Casibus* follows, with its reflections in the reworkings of Chaucer and Lydgate. Chapters V and VI treat of the moralities, Chapters VII and VIII of the *Mirror for Magistrates* and its "progeny." The establishment of tragedy on the Elizabethan stage is then reviewed, in the light of the preceding analysis. A concluding chapter (X) is devoted mainly to Shakespeare. "Death, whether dramatically prepared for or not, is peculiarly the final concern of Gothic tragedy," but "at its best Elizabethan tragedy, unlike medieval tragedy, can bear witness effectively to man's spiritual greatness, presenting it in terms of this world and bringing it most sharply to our understanding" (pp. 422-24). The English fearlessness of death, the effectiveness of comedy as contrast to tragedy, and varying conceptions of tragic justice, are then discussed. The perception that life is heroic in intolerance of evil is characteristic of the drama of Shakespeare; he

purges our emotions of pity and fear by making us acquiesce without bitterness in catastrophe which at first sight may seem the result of goodness turning false to itself and aiding evil in the production of suffering with cruelly refined irony. . . All that Shakespeare alone will permit us to say is that the yoke of life is hard but supremely worth the bearing in the interest of general good (pp. 445-6).

The structural form of Shakespearean tragedy is examined: *Hamlet* and *Macbeth* recall the rise and fall of Fortune's wheel (Gothic tragedy does not always balance the two movements nicely), while *Othello* and *Lear* are "in no sense tragedies of rise and fall through aspiring action so far as their heroes are concerned" (p. 451).

The foregoing outline gives, of course, no adequate idea of the detailed analysis of varying conceptions of tragedy in the four hundred and fifty pages of text in Professor Farnham's book, but it may serve to show the chief topics which he treats, and to suggest his general method. There is much which has independent value and interest apart from the main subject, like the treatment of

Boccaccio and of the *Mirror for Magistrates*. He has already published valuable studies in those subjects which will be recalled by readers of periodical essays. In general, he approaches tragedy through interpretation, in terms of a philosophy of life, of the problem of evil and suffering, and of the parts played in relation to it by man and the powers that rule the universe. Close examination of these conceptions, or comment on details, would obviously be out of place in a brief review. But we may, perhaps, consider whether the promise of the title is quite fulfilled, whether a somewhat broader treatment is not necessary for such fulfilment.

Professor Farnham does not regard the contribution of the cyclic miracle plays as important, and devotes little space to them, remarking, "the tragic spirit must be said to have remained rudimentary among the writers of mysteries. Those of their plays which arouse in us something of tragic pity or fear do so with little more than the unstudied simplicity and the casual art of the folk ballad" (pp. 173-4). The late Professor Ashley H. Thorndike, in his admirable *Tragedy* (Boston and New York, 1908), traced, in briefer fashion, the whole development from classic times through the nineteenth century. He emphasized strongly the contribution of the miracle plays.

A glance at some of the most notable differences of the miracles from classical plays reveals traits that remained potent in later drama . . . From the medieval drama the Elizabethans inherited not only dramatic form, but an entire method of stage presentation different from the classical. . . . Another far-reaching inheritance from the miracle plays was derived from their treatment of tragic themes and situations and from their pervading seriousness of purpose (pp. 24-26).

Can all this be disregarded?

Again, it seems to me that too little allowance is made by Professor Farnham for the Germanic strain in English moralizings about death and misfortune. Everyone knows how prominent this mood was in Anglo-Saxon literature. "Fate goeth ever as it will" is as striking there as in classical and humanistic tradition. How this continued in the Middle English period is clearly shown when the vernacular lyrics are compared with their French prototypes. Even in Shakespearean tragedy Germanic conceptions have to be reckoned with, as for example the duty of revenge in *Hamlet* or the Witches in *Macbeth*. Professor Kittredge remarks,

The Weird Sisters are the Norns of Scandinavian mythology. . . . Their presence is due to the large infusion of Norse blood in the Scottish race, and their function is in full accord with the doctrines of Norse heathendom. That function, then, was an essential element in the history of *Macbeth* as it came into Shakespeare's hands (*Complete Works of Shakespeare*, Boston, etc., 1936, p. 1114).

I say nothing here of the necessity of making allowance for the effect of medieval stories and traditions upon which Shakespeare often based serious plots; I have discussed it in detail elsewhere.

This will serve to indicate, in the briefest fashion, some of the medieval influences upon the spirit and development of Elizabethan tragedy which Professor Farnham does not appear to me to take sufficiently into account. On the other hand, the treatment of those subjects which do receive particular attention is suggestive and valuable. Upon this a great deal of thought and labor has obviously been expended, and the results will repay careful reading. The volume is a beautiful piece of book-making, with clear type and open pages. Well-reproduced illustrations from contemporary sources serve to make early conceptions of tragedy more vivid to the reader.

WILLIAM WITHERLE LAWRENCE

Columbia University

-
- Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age.* By C. J. Sisson. Cambridge, England: At the University Press; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1936. Pp. xii + 224. \$3.75.
- A Study of Love's Labour's Lost.* By FRANCES A. YATES (Shakespeare Problems, ed. A. W. Pollard and J. D. Wilson, v.) Cambridge, England: At the University Press; New York, The Macmillan Company, 1936. Pp. viii + 224. \$2.50.
- A Hamlet Bibliography and Reference Guide 1877-1935.* By ANTON ADOLPH RAVEN. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936. Pp. xvi + 292. \$3.50.
- Death and Elizabethan Tragedy.* By THEODORE SPENCER. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936. Pp. xiv + 290. \$2.50.
- Elizabethan Comic Conventions as Revealed in the Comedies of George Chapman.* By PAUL V. KREIDER. (University of Michigan Publications, Language and Literature, xvii.) Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1935. Pp. xii + 210. \$2.50.
- The Sources of John Dryden's Comedies.* By NED BLISS ALLEN. (University of Michigan Publications, Language and Literature, xvi.) Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1935. Pp. xviii + 300. \$3.00.
- Ben Jonson on the English Stage 1660-1776.* By ROBERT GALE NOYES. (Harvard Studies in English, xvii.) Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935. Pp. xii + 352. \$3.50.

From the Public Record Office and elsewhere Professor Sisson assembles details of some curious and apparently far from unique

transactions, which he fuses in a study that restores several minor pieces, almost brings back two lost plays by important writers, and constantly illuminates the working conditions under which they and their colleagues wrote. But above all this book is a titbit for the connoisseur of Tudor and Stuart drama. It really is delicious: a handsome piece of bookmaking, it not only takes us behind the scene, it affords a model of how scholarship can be worn lightly without loss of either dignity or cogency. Not the least of the author's merits is modesty. He writes of discovery without distorting its significance; document searching and inference both shrewd and sound are happily associated.

Star Chamber was the recourse of many a libelled Elizabethan; and "of the various ways of publishing a libel, none was so effective as presentation in dramatic form, and none was more congenial to the Elizabethan mind." Mr. Sisson thinks the relationship worked both ways. A play or a jig might constitute Exhibit A at the Court. On the other hand, Star Chamber cases "may have purveyed to the London stage a great deal of topical material" Further research in the records, he believes, "may yet throw much light on Elizabethan comedy."

Half the book is devoted to *The Old Joiner of Aldgate* (Chapman, 1603) and *Keep the Widow Waking* (Dekker, Rowley, Ford, and Webster, 1624.) Our stoical Chapman, it now appears, was not above a bit of dramatic though probably not of venal journalism. It was his pen that turned into a play the plight of Agnes Howe, the barber's lass, dubiously married to the Reverend Dr. John Milward, and charged by one of her many suitors and by her rapacious father with a pre-contract, to mention but one of her alleged betrothals. Her husband was actually accused by a contemporary "disintegrator," as Mr. Sisson wittily dubs him, of collaboration with the great dramatist in *The Old Joiner* while litigation was in progress. It is an amusing story, though it could not have been very amusing to the heroine. But Mr. Sisson does not stop there. He adds an ingenious reconstruction of the lost play, and a caveat on dramatic topicality:

Who knows what fanciful exegesis might not have been applied to Chapman's play [had it survived, instead of "these records of actual events which begot" it], with such a suggestive story? What hard heart would not receive it for an allegory of Queen Elizabeth with her many suitors at auction for her favor? . . . But for once the play is lost and the facts are found. . . . It may be that the topical bases of many a play are indeed of such humble stuff as this. If Snipper Snapper [the barber of *The Joiner*] was in reality a barber, may not many pigwomen or sellers of mouse-traps be in fact pigwomen and sellers of mouse-traps?

The Late Murder in Whitechapel, or Keep the Widow Waking is no less topical and no less instructive. So, among a number of good things, is Mr. Sisson's chapter on the Jig, for he is able to offer two full-length specimens.

Miss Yates, on the other hand, goes in for topicality with a vengeance, though a certain restraint differentiates her from the quacks who are so conspicuous among the practitioners of this popular branch of the learned art. She does not tell us what song the sirens sang, but by the time she reaches page 149 she is able to announce that among the books the king and his friends are studying at the opening of *Love's Labour's Lost* is the *Opticae Thesaurus* of Hasan ibn Hasan! She concedes the origin of the comic types in the *commedia dell'arte*, but she thinks that Shakespeare used them to ridicule several living persons. She would not, however, quarrel with Professor Sisson's caveat; indeed she winds up her account of the evidence for Florio by admitting in so many words that "Holofernes is—Holofernes." Nevertheless, in partial defence of Warburton's equation of Holofernes and Florio, she insists that the latter's patron, Southampton, had good reason for disliking him on religious grounds and may therefore have welcomed a satire on him by another attaché. Miss Yates considers her case vastly strengthened when she brings forward John Eliot's *Ortho-epia Gallica*, 1593, in which Florio is attacked and parodied. "It was 'topical' to laugh at him." This is certainly interesting; but it proves nothing unless a genuine connection can be established between the satire in the two works. This, in the reviewer's opinion, Miss Yates is not quite able to do; and she concludes that Florio is not the "original" of any character, but merely "one of the people against whom the oblique satire of the play is directed." Eliot viewed with alarm the Protestant refugee language teachers, and Miss Yates suggests that Shakespeare agreed with him. Berowne, at any rate, is distrustful of scholarship; and the learned style of Harvey is possibly under Shakespeare's critical fire as well as under Eliot's. Chapman, in her opinion, completes the trio of Shakespeare's victims in the passages on pedantry.

Thus far the argument, if tenuous in substance, is rational enough, though one may doubt here and there whether Miss Yates is not carrying a joke too far. It is when she moves on to claim, on the ground of Florio's interest in Bruno and the Petrarchist controversy, that Shakespeare not only was *au courant* with its present manifestations and past history but in *LLL* is actually defending "Stella" from the indirect attacks of Bruno the Copernican (Miss Yates thinks that *Berowne* is intended to recall *Bruno*), thus accounting for the recurrent antithesis in the play between stars and ladies' eyes, and presenting Shakespeare as a chivalrous if not quite disinterested champion of the Essex-Southampton forces in Lady Rich's behalf against the Raleigh-Northumberland camp—it is at this point that many of her readers, while admiring the ingenuity of the argument, will probably find it far too circumstantial and circuitous. Space is lacking to cite more than one illustration, and no such summary can be fair to the thesis. Sidney

writes that Stella "even in black doth make all beauties flow," Berowne declares that Rosaline is "born to make black fair," and Miss Yates comments, "This seems rather a coincidence." She does indeed direct us to a surprising number of points of contact or resemblance among the works of the various authors she marshals; but too many of these have no more value as evidence than the insignificant lines just quoted. When she asserts that her thesis "is remarkably confirmed" by a discovery she has made in the Public Record Office, she puts the case too strongly. The document in question is "an essay by the Earl of Northumberland," which Miss Yates assumes "to be addressed to his wife," "Stella's" sister, announcing his abandonment of love in favor of science. Since Shakespeare "is reversing and contradicting the argument of this essay," that is, since he shows several gentlemen who turn from study to love (as, in the words of the old song, "many have done before"), Miss Yates concludes that he is defending not Penelope alone but *both* the Devereux sisters, unhappy in their marriages and insulted by the "artists," that is, by the learned and the pretenders to learning.¹

Finally, "the immediate inspiration" of both *LLL* and the Earl's "Essay" was the Gray's Inn Revels of 1594-5, "with their mock speeches in praise, alternately, of study and of pleasure." Shakespeare must have attended these revels "since one of his plays was acted during the course of them," certainly a non-sequitur. "Many of the minor jokes in the play are, I believe, Gray's Inn gossip and slang, and it was written at some time during 1595, after the revels." Chapman is the rival poet. Shakespeare inclined to the Catholics at Southampton House, and *LLL* may therefore contain expressions of that sympathy, natural enough to one who, Miss Yates believes, may have begun as a country schoolmaster "in some secret Catholic school." In fact, Miss Yates actually finds a "Catholic" moral in the play: Berowne's twelvemonth of charitable exercises is Shakespeare's answer to Raleigh's atheism! The whole argument is summarized by the author on pages 20-26 of the Introduction, where the reader, grateful for a clear exposition of an intricate thesis, is in some danger of being seduced by his gratitude into acceptance of the conclusions. As they appear *in extenso* on the subsequent pages they are not always so cogent, nor so moderate; though they are the fruit of much labor and learning. The book is an intellectual exercise which compels respect. But while there is too little imagination in a great deal of our literary scholarship, here there is perhaps too much. It is also unfortunate that Mr. Fred Sorenson's "'The Masque of the Muscovites' in *Love's Labour's Lost*," *MLN*, L (Dec., 1935), 499-501, evidently appeared too late for Miss Yates's consideration.

¹ The assumption that "Stella" is always Lady Rich is of course dubious in itself. See, for example, Dr. Walter G. Friedrich's sceptical review of the whole question in *ELH*, III (June, 1936), 114-139.

Miss Yates smells a mouse, *mus* (as Holofernes might say) at every occurrence of the word "Muscovite", but Mr. Sorenson makes this piece of evidence valueless when he cites Holinshed's account of a Russian and Turkish masquing by Henry VIII and his courtiers. Blackamoor torchbearers were a part of it. If Shakespeare required a source for his Russians, he needed not have waited till 1595. To sum up, Miss Yates's synthetic powers have created a clever pattern, but one remains uncertain whether the pattern in Shakespeare's mind was anything like so neat, whether the great man did not hew to his own line and let his quips fall where they might.

A *Hamlet* bibliography which picks up where the Furness Variorum leaves off and carries on past the beginning of the M. H. R. A. bibliographies to 1935 serves a useful purpose, and Professor Raven seems to have made a good job of it. His scope includes all books, formal sections of books, and articles, in all languages; important editions; and selected reviews of criticism and of actors' conceptions. More than half the 2167 items are summarized, with resolute objectivity. It is, for example, impossible to tell whether Mr. Raven considers the Prince sane or crazy. He is equally non-committal on Hamlet's critics. I find but one clue to his state of mind, it appears in the preface: "scholars—and others—have poured fourth a ceaseless stream of comments." My italics. His dashes.

Suitably bound in handsome black cloth, Dr Theodore Spencer's study is worthy of its great theme. For, as he suggests in his preface, death is poetry's greatest subject, indeed, the greatest poetry never gets very far away from it. For lovers the thought of it can never long be absent; and so the great lyric poetry of the Renaissance, as well as the great tragedies, accepts it either as the central theme or as the unexpressed condition under which the central theme must be discussed. Mr. Spencer's book is a systematic collection of instances woven into an easy essay style. After sixty-five pages on the medieval background, he sets forth the effect of the sixteenth-century enrichment of English on the phraseology in which death is handled. The old words and ideas were revitalized and multiplied, till when Shakespeare approached the subject there was ready for his delicate art of novel juxtaposition an enormous stock, the mere existence of which intensified the effect of his allusions. Convention, which he learned to utilize with such craft in the technical department of playwrighting, was, Mr. Spencer demonstrates, of service here as well. "Granted the poet's native gifts, the more rooted in convention he is, the more *imaginative* his writing will be;" and he has a solid bridge straight to the emotional core of his audience. *Death and Elizabethan Tragedy* is scarcely News from Hell, but speech after speech of the great dramatists is not so much reinterpreted as supplied with fuller connotations by Mr. Spencer's thoughtful commentary. An index,

which includes play titles, adds to the availability of this unusual and valuable book, since students of the Elizabethan drama will wish to transfer many of the author's observations to their notes on particular passages.

Professor Kreider's dissertation classifies Chapman's comic characters and his methods of handling them.

Professor Allen points out that Dryden's comedies have received less critical attention than the other works. He began his dissertation with the intention of estimating the relative weight of English and foreign influence and of formulating Dryden's contribution to Restoration comedy. But since "Dryden's rule was to sacrifice everything to please the public," Mr. Allen found it impossible to plot a curve of development, and altered his plan. Accordingly, he discusses separate plays and groups of plays, with special attention to their sources. Since, however, "it is probably safe to say that Dryden never created when he could borrow," and since Mr. Allen has critical gifts and knows how to write, his learned and incisive monograph is more comprehensive than its title indicates. It is, in fact, a substantial contribution.

Dr. Noyes's study is a sound piece of scholarship, admirably composed, and from cover to cover full of interest for every lover of Ben and his glorious comedies. It must here be described rather than summarized. Opening with thirty-six pages on Jonson's reputation, Mr. Noyes proceeds play by play to trace their fortunes on the stage. Highly factual and thoroughly documented, his pages are enlivened with anecdote and humor; and he succeeds in taking us into the Restoration and eighteenth-century playhouses. An appendix provides a chronological table of performances and a list of editions, from 1660 to 1776, the date of Garrick's retirement, after which it became "positively hazardous" to revive Jonson.

HAZELTON SPENCER

The Enchanted Glass: The Elizabethan Mind in Literature. By HARDIN CRAIG. New York: Oxford University Press, 1936. Pp. ix + 293. \$2.50.

Each of Professor Craig's ten chapters has a prefatory quotation from *The Advancement of Learning*, and the book as a whole might be called "The Advancement of Elizabethan Learning," since it is at once a philosophic summary and a program. The unifying text is that "erudition—science, pseudo-science, philosophy, history, school learning in general with all its vagaries and variations—has an important bearing on the interpretation of the literature of the Renaissance." Accordingly Professor Craig surveys the whole body of knowledge which constituted the

intellectual possession of the Elizabethan writer and the intellectual basis of Elizabethan literature. The substantial and lucid chapters range from cosmology, religion, psychology, rhetoric, and logic, to alchemy, astrology, and demonology. In all these sciences, legitimate and illegitimate, the path Professor Craig has to follow is not straight and narrow but devious and broad. The Elizabethans were far from ignorant, but they knew a great many things that weren't so. The author, however, is not arraigning the vanities of learning, since "even the errors of Renaissance science led into the heart of the literary world." Hence Cornelius Agrippa rubs shoulders with Hooker. (Incidentally, for the second edition that one hopes will be needed, one may mention the slip in Hooker's name on pp. 15 and 71). Everywhere we are reminded of the solid strength and value of the classical tradition, even though it appeared in altered and adulterated forms. Everywhere too we are made to realize how much closer the Renaissance mind was to the medieval than to the modern, and how much learned reconstruction is needed to understand a large part of Elizabethan writing. The difficulties are not only in the way of multifarious dead "facts," but even more in dead systems of thought which gave a pattern or a color to modes of seeing and feeling. The Renaissance mind is exhibited in its extraordinary mixture of uncritical faith and bold speculation, of vague, inconsistent confusedness and rigidly logical formalism; it was, in short, a mind which "moved habitually on a conceptual rather than a rational level." Professor Craig does not forget his object nor lose himself in antiquarianism; Elizabethan learning is constantly related to Elizabethan literature. (To admit some doubts about the closeness of that relation in parts of the argument about psychology in popular drama is perhaps only to brand oneself a heretic). While providing a compendious encyclopaedia of Renaissance knowledge, emphasizing the scholar's need of mastering it, and illustrating the use of it for the interpretation of literature, Professor Craig is fully aware that the Elizabethans were not lacking in the timeless essentials of great writing, the wisdom and insight and imaginative power which are independent of knowledge and intellectual systems. Besides, whatever unsound bone and flesh were contained in that body of knowledge, it was more immediately available for literature, and was richer in quality, than our much greater and more accurate body of knowledge is.

The world order was at once theological, legal, scientific, psychological, and moral. It was designed to provide for everything. It was, if you like, poetry at work in the world preparing a grand solution of the problems of human existence; it did not recognize itself as poetry, but thought of itself as constituting all the prosaic branches of human learning.

Such a synthesis as this book could be achieved only by a scholar of very exceptional learning and sympathy who is at home both

on the highroads of the Renaissance mind and in what now appear to be byways but were not always such. This is a book that has been needed, and it should be required reading for all graduate students (and not merely because the seeker after thesis subjects will be rewarded). Students of any age may profit from the general argument and from the compact and suggestive discussions of a multitude of topics which are commonly slighted in purely literary criticism or left unphilosophized in learned articles. The twenty-four pages of notes make a valuable working bibliography for the English Renaissance.

DOUGLAS BUSH

Harvard University

The Arte of English Poesie. By GEORGE PUTTENHAM. Edited by GLADYS DOIGE WILCOCK and ALICE WALKER. Cambridge: University Press, 1936. Pp. cx + 359. \$6 00.

Directions for Speech and Style. By JOHN HOSKINS. Edited by HOYT H. HUDSON. (Princeton Studies in English, 12.) Princeton: University Press, 1935. Pp. xl + 122. \$2.50.

Students of Renaissance critical literature should be highly pleased with these new contributions to the study of this fascinating subject. Puttenham's *The Arte of English Poesie*, important for stylistic interpretations and frequently mentioned in Elizabethan scholia, has been available heretofore in haphazard editions only. Hoskins' *Directions for Speech and Style* has been for too long like Hamlet's father—a ghost teasing the thought and stalking behind the scenes. We now have both of these works in usable form thanks to the conscientious efforts of able and scholarly editors.

The new edition of Puttenham is oriented for the reader by means of a penetrating and critical preface in which the major problems of authorship, date of composition, and literary principles are delineated and evaluated. The editors succeed through an overpowering assemblage of facts and through the instrument of rigorous logic in eliminating Captain Ward's strong hypothesis that Lord Lumley was the author of the *Arte*. With similar vigor they reestablish, at the expense of Richard Puttenham, the claims of George Puttenham to the authorship and in so doing give us the best account thus far of George Puttenham's career. The section on the composition date of the *Arte* provides the editors with an opportunity to reveal not only the facets of Puttenham's mentality but to supply us with new implements for the study of literary growth and accretion. With good reasons they abandon the old date of 1585 set by Arber and show that the work is more closely linked to the tradition of *The Governour*, the *Arte of Rhetorique*, and the *Scholemaster*. The author of the *Arte*, as

the editors observe, is more familiar with the *Songes and Sonettes* than with the *Shepherd's Calendar*; and a critic with these penchants is certainly not in keeping with the temper of the eighties. The conclusion, and there is testimony to support it, is that the *Arte* was laid out years before and circulated in manuscript. When it was finally given to the printer, the author gave it a little revision that took cognizance of current trends, but the spirit remained that of an earlier era. The sections devoted to Puttenham as a critic are equally thought-stirring in their analysis and unfortunately cannot be given in summary.

The text of this edition is based on B. M., G. 11548 with B. M. C. 21.b.18 used as an ancillary text. A sampling of these texts against the new edition indicates a most scrupulous piece of editing.

Professor Hudson's edition of Hoskins' *Directions* is founded on Harleian MS 4604 and represents the first presentation of this work in which the true author is named. Written from a schoolmaster's point of view, the *Directions* becomes especially significant when one realizes that it reveals the methods in which most of the late Elizabethans and early Jacobeans were trained. This point is further emphasized by Professor Hudson's demonstration of the influence of Hoskins on Jonson, Blount, and Smith, all of whom took over some of his material verbatim.

Without question Puttenham and Hoskins should be read in contrast for such a reading would do more than many scholarly disquisitions to suggest the difference in attitude between a generation that thought of *Euphues* as something new and daring and one that thought of it as old fashioned and out-moded.

Both of these editions have many other virtues to recommend. The editors have been realistic in the handling of annotations with which neither text is overloaded. Fortunately, they have also disregarded the Spingarn tradition in the study of sources for we have in neither book any attempt to father ideas of the author on Castelvetro, Minturno, or Varchi. Instead of this far-fetched association we find mention of Sturm, Talaueus, and Susenbrotus who, as anyone who has looked into this literature knows, are the talismanic names for Englishmen of this period.

DON CAMERON ALLEN

State College of Washington

Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman. By KENNETH ORNE MYRICK. (Harvard Studies in English, xiv.) Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935. Pp. x + 322. \$3.50.

Like other recent Sidney studies, this volume for the most part develops in detail several ideas expressed rather abstractly by the

late Professor Greenlaw in the short articles on Sidney which he published in the Kittredge and the Manly anniversary studies. "It was a point of honor among gentlemen writers in that age," Greenlaw observed, "to affect contempt for their literary works." Dr. Myrick now gives this affected contempt a local habitation and a name by pointing out that it is an example of that urbane quality which Castiglione calls *sprezzatura*. This quality the author considers the key to an understanding of Sidney's habits of mind and the sense of values which prompted his instinctive actions. "If in his life and actions he [Sidney] shows this quality," Dr. Myrick continues, "we may expect to find in the *Defence of Poesie*, the *Arcadia*, and *Astrophel and Stella* an artistry no less self-conscious, though often concealed here also in an appearance of spontaneity." The author then compares the *Defence of Poesie* with the rules laid down by classical rhetoricians, and finds that from beginning to end the essay is planned according to these rules; it contains all seven parts of the classical oration. Dr. Myrick sometimes finds it difficult to force parts of the *Defence* into his pattern (e. g., p. 116), and the reader will sometimes wish that he had exhibited more *sprezzatura*. He leaves no doubt, however, that in writing the *Defence* Sidney was guided by the rules of criticism, which he followed not slavishly, but "as a gentleman will obey the code of etiquette."

Emphasizing that Sidney's classicism is that of the Renaissance, Dr. Myrick then attempts to show that the *New Arcadia* follows Minturno's rules for the heroic poem in subject and in structure; "where Sidney departs from the authority of Minturno, we may find in the *Defence* . . . a clear indication of his guiding principles." Certain features of the *Arcadia*, such as its great length, its mass of episodic material, and its ornateness in style, Dr. Myrick finds justified by the rules given by Minturno and by those laid down in the *Defence*. There is then a clear relation between the *Arcadia* and the *Defence*; "the one illustrates the theories of the other, and both reveal the same quality of deliberate art guided by law." Surely Greenlaw had this in mind when he wrote that "by Sidney and his contemporaries, *Arcadia* was regarded as an heroic poem," and that this heroic poem is a "concrete application of the theories of the province of poetry laid down in his *Defense*."

In his chapters on "Sidney's Theory of Poetic Truth" and "Poetic Truth in the *New Arcadia*," the author attacks Greenlaw's theory that Sidney believed that "the great epics should be regarded as allegories," and that, following the theories of poetry laid down in his *Defence*, Sidney attempted in the *Arcadia* to produce "an 'historicall fiction,' a prose counterpart of the *Faerie Queene*, having for its object 'to fashion a gentleman or noble person in vertuous and gentle discipline,' and to portray 'a good governour and a vertuous man.'" Sidney did not conceive of poetry

as allegory, says Dr. Myrick. "On the contrary, the basis of Sidney's theory of poetry is the Aristotelian idea of representative fiction, or imitation." Yet, the author continues, "poetic truth is for Sidney neither the realism of modern fiction, nor the classic imitation of men in action, according to the law of probability." It is "what the late Professor Babbitt called imagination of an ethical quality."

And what does Sidney create in the *Arcadia* by means of this "imagination"? The author answers:

The *Arcadia* is not a treatise about public and private virtue. Still less is it an idle tale, composed "to beguile a summer's holiday." Nor is it merely a composite work of varied texture, as Mr. Zandvoort suggests. It is an heroic poem which makes noble conduct beautiful.

Which is what Greenlaw meant when he called the *Arcadia* "a prose counterpart of the *Faerie Queene*."

In his final chapter, the author cites "comic" passages from the *Arcadia* and *Astrophel and Stella* to show that *sprezzatura* is found in both works. This chapter adds nothing to Sidney's stature and little to Dr. Myrick's volume.

In his preface, the author states that he has attempted "a new synthesis of facts which for the most part are already well known." To the reviewer, however, it seems that the value of the monograph consists in its analysis and development of abstractions "which for the most part are already well known." Exigencies of publication apparently made it impossible for Dr. Myrick to take advantage of Dr. M. S. Goldman's encyclopedic *Sir Philip Sidney and the Arcadia*.

WALTER G. FRIEDRICH

Valparaiso University

Ancients and Moderns. A Study of the Background of the 'Battle of the Books.' By RICHARD FOSTER JONES. St. Louis: Washington University Press, 1936. Pp. xii + 358. \$3.00. (Washington University Studies, Lang. and Lit., n. s. vi.)

Students of Restoration and eighteenth-century literature have long been familiar with Professor R. F. Jones's indispensable monograph entitled "The Background of the *Battle of the Books*." Although the present volume gives "an amplified treatment of the same subject," namely, "that the quarrel out of which Swift's satire sprang had its roots in the conflict between the new science and old learning, and not in France" (p. vii), it is not simply an extension of the original article but a fresh study in which Professor Jones writes a history of the "idea of science," or faith in the inductive method, from the Elizabethan period to 1672. De-

tans were among the best friends the new science had and also that Bacon's enormous prestige in the Restoration was in no small measure due to the popularization which his doctrine received at the hands of Puritan reformers like Biggs and Webster.

The remaining portion of the book gives a detailed account of the quarrel between the Baconians and the conservatives in the Restoration, which, as is well known, reached a critical stage during the years 1660 to 1672. There are interesting pages on the relation between Cartesianism and Baconianism, on the opinions of such champions of conservatism as Meric Casaubon and Dr. Henry Stubbe, on the energetic support of the new method by the Paracelsians, or chemical doctors, and on the various writings in defense of the *Virtuosi* by Boyle, Sprat, and Glanvill.

Instructive as the results of Professor Jones's researches undoubtedly are, one wishes that he had not chosen to present them by analyzing the contents of "each pertinent work as it appeared" (p. viii). This method, he frankly points out, "entails a good deal of repetition and prevents the focusing of all the evidence at one time upon an idea," but he hopes that "there is compensation in the historical sweep gained by it" (p. ix). The repetitions are numerous, especially in the developments on the Puritan and the Restoration periods. But the really unfortunate result of the method used is that, despite Professor Jones's summaries and conclusions, the various "ideas" remain disconnected and scattered. There is steady progression from book to book rather than from "idea" to "idea." Accordingly, the "historical sweep," the gradual historical unfolding of the conception of science in the seventeenth century, is not so clearly exhibited as one could wish. Furthermore, it seems unpardonable that in a book so closely packed with information as this one there should be no index.

R. W. FRANTZ

University of Nebraska

Johnsonian Gleanings, Part VII (Jervis, Porter, and other allied families). By ALEYN L. READE. London: Percy Lund, Humphries and Co., 1935. Pp. vi + 226 (+ map and table).

Johnson and English Poetry before 1660. By W. B. C. WATKINS. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1936. Pp. 120. \$1.75. (Princeton Studies in English, XIII.)

Mr. Reade reminds us that he is before everything else a genealogist by interrupting his narrative of Johnson's life with an entire volume of pedigrees—"really only a kind of genealogical appendix to Part vi." The connection of much of this material with

Johnson is extremely tenuous, as the author himself admits in a disarming paragraph which he must have written in anticipatory parody of the reviewers: "It may seem a far cry from the Eedes family to Dr. Johnson, yet the train of causation appears complete between them. It was the friendship of the Darells with the Eedeses, and Anne Darell having had Francis Eedes for her guardian, which led to her connexion with Warwick, where she started her married life with William Jervis. And later, when as a widow she came back to Warwick, it was evidently through the Colmores, who had come from Birmingham, and were trustees of the Jervis estate, that her daughter, Elizabeth Jervis, made the acquaintance of the Colmores' cousin, Harry Porter, and married him. And it was only through 'Tetty' so becoming the wife of a Birmingham man that Johnson came to meet her, and, in due course, marry her himself." The book is enlivened by Mr. Reade's groans at his failure to achieve certainty at all points ("... difficulty in the descent of the Porters, which tormented me, and still torments me when I think of it"). It is accompanied by a curious and entertaining folding map, drawn "to illustrate Dr. Johnson's Origins and Family Associations as well as his Life and Movements down to 1740." And it ends with one of Mr. Reade's admirable indexes. Any scholar who faces the task of indexing an 18th Century text should place Mr. Reade's volumes at his elbow. He will find there fuller and more accurate identifications and dates than in any other source.

In a slender volume of a little over one hundred pages, Mr. Watkins summarizes the results of an extensive statistical investigation into the character and extent of Johnson's knowledge of English poetry before the Reformation. The great source of his information is naturally the *Dictionary*. Other readers will probably share this reviewer's surprise on being shown how much Johnson had read in Spenser and Donne, and shocked to learn that, when everything has been examined, he cannot be proved to have read any of Marlowe's plays, any of Shakespeare's sonnets, or more of Beaumont and Fletcher than he found in the notes of Warburton's *Shakespeare*. Some very interesting problems emerge: what does it indicate concerning the method of compiling the *Dictionary* when we find Johnson making no quotations whatever from an author (e.g. Thomas Tusser) in the earlier letters of the alphabet, and then quoting him copiously in the remainder? Mr. Watkins's essays are lucidly and pleasantly written, but he feels too much the necessity of defending Johnson's critical reputation, and he would have pleased scholars better if he had not used the American reprint of Hill's Boswell for constant reference. I am somewhat troubled by his frequently styling a work a "favorite" of Johnson. Can one safely conclude that, because a work is frequently quoted in the *Dictionary*, Johnson was fond of it? A man reading for

quotations does not necessarily select favorite pieces; he reads whatever lies readiest to hand. If Johnson in the *Dictionary* quotes from *The New Inn* and not from *The Alchemist*, *The Silent Woman*, and *Volpone*, must we infer that he preferred *The New Inn* as literature? A more reasonable conclusion might be that his set of Jonson lacked a volume.

FREDERICK A. POTTLE

Yale University

Lord Chesterfield. By SAMUEL SHELLABARGER. New York: Macmillan, 1935. Pp. xiv + 422. \$5.00.

Here Mr. Shellabarger aims to present an "interpenetration of a book, a man, an age, and a philosophy" in the effort to "bring Chesterfield's life into a new, and the only proper focus. Curiously enough, it has never been attempted before." Following the lead of this puff on the dust jacket, one finds the new focus to be that Chesterfield is, *par excellence*, the Man of the World (the subtitle, incidentally, of the very first biography of Chesterfield, published in 1774). As such, one reads repeatedly, his life was an empty shell, devoid of friends, love, religion. Although "he was better, wiser, more gifted, than most men of the world" and hence would rank high "under the pagan dispensation," Mr. Shellabarger concludes, "There can be no compromise of any sort between right and wrong. . . . Judged by the real, not the conventional Christian practice, he would have no rank at all."

Many will praise this biography, but I cannot. The bright style would adequately compensate for its lack of new material if the book did bring Chesterfield's life into a new focus, even if only tolerably proper. To do this, however, scrupulous accuracy of detail is necessary, and this the book lacks. Its thesis, based on the assumption that Chesterfield had no friends, requires that his friendships be explained away, despite the evidence of many letters and of earlier commentators, dismissed as "apologists." Mr. Shellabarger would be more convincing if his text were not, at every point where my particular knowledge extends—especially in bibliographical detail—honeycombed with little misstatements, indicative, one would judge, of superficial work, and hence of an inadequate understanding of the subject. He thus provides a distortion, not a new focus, to the life of Chesterfield.¹ The life by

¹ The sincerity of Chesterfield's friendships cannot be proved but will, I believe, be evident to any careful reader of his letters.

Representative of obvious errors are these. (385) In addition to £100 annuity each for life, the grandsons were to divide not only the interest on £10,000 but the principal as well. (400-401) This list omits the major reviews—the *Annual Register* alone excepted—of the *Letters*. These reviews show that the *Letters* were eagerly received; the first stinging

Bonamy Dobrée, forming an introduction to his edition of the *Letters* (1932), has not been superseded.

SIDNEY L. GULICK, JR.

Mills College

Thomas De Quincey, A Biography. By HORACE AINSWORTH EATON.
New York: Oxford University Press, 1936. Pp. xvi + 542.
\$5.00.

Professor Eaton's *Thomas De Quincey* deliberately subordinates literary criticism to a detailed and illuminating account of the events of his life. The writer has "endeavoured as far as it has been humanly possible, to be exhaustive" in his research, and it may at once be said that his book conveys the impression of complete knowledge and understanding of all the ascertainable facts. There is no attempt at psycho-analytical interpretation in the modern biographical manner, and yet, in the result, the portrayal of the man is shown to depend on a grasp of the experiences of his loveless childhood. The loss of his father and the death of a beloved little sister, combined with the creed of a mother who believed it right to suppress all signs of affection in her dealings with her children are felt, and no doubt rightly, to be the cause and explanation of De Quincey's incapacity to adjust himself to the demands of life, just as they are also the underlying source of his own devotion to children in later years. The sensitive boy with his aching desire for sympathy and understanding grew naturally into the emotional man with his passionate adoration of little Catherine Wordsworth, and the shrinking from reality which taught him to substitute dreams and nightmares for facts which were unendurably harsh and shattering. Yet it must not be supposed that De Quincey was weak or lacking in will-power. "His indomitable will is, as it were, the hard kernel of his character. . . . He was no weakling. . . . On the contrary, he was self-contained, self-assured, even, in a sense arrogant underneath his outward gentleness. His nature made him essentially solitary in the fastness of his own personality, aloof from men and the world; and with unquestioning reliance upon his own measure of values."

Professor Eaton's account of De Quincey's marriage, if Crabb Robinson's details in cypher are to be trusted, as they can be since he had them direct from Wordsworth, put De Quincey's behaviour in too favourable a light. But the marriage was nevertheless one

rebuke, in fact, did not appear until eight months after the publication. (Cf. 388-9, "Few were bold enough to defend the *Letters*. One or two reviews dared to praise it mildly.") (ix) Chesterfield's attitude towards publication is a matter of court record; cf. my article in *PMLA*, LI (1936), 170.

proof of his independence, and of his "reliance upon his own measure of values." The same is true of his behaviour to Coleridge in whose genius he believed sufficiently to back his faith with a gift of £300 at a time when he possessed no more than £2000 in all. And similar independence of mind is shown in many incidents from his boyhood onwards, in his "elopement" from Manchester Grammar School, his break with his guardians, and above all in his devotion of his powers to journalism. De Quincey is remembered chiefly as the Opium Eater who ruined himself by indulgence in his vice, and who spent a life in squalor largely attributable to evil habits. Professor Eaton properly lays stress on other aspects of the man and his achievements, with the result that his portrait is of a credible and lovable person, faulty no doubt, but attractive in himself as well as in many of his voluminous writings. It is improbable that he will ever again come to be ranked among the greatest of prose-writers in English, though we think that in recent years his literary work has been unduly neglected. After the masterly analysis of his life and character in Professor Eaton's book, it is also unlikely that ever again these will be so unfairly judged as has often been the case. De Quincey saw visions and he dreamed dreams, and with all his faults, he retained to the end something of the child-likeness which is of the kingdom of heaven.

EDITH J. MORLEY

University of Reading, England

Flowers of Evil. From the French of CHARLES BAUDELAIRE.
By GEORGE DILLON and EDNA ST. VINCENT MILLAY. With
the Original Texts and with a Preface by MISS MILLAY. New
York and London: Harper, 1936. \$2.75.

These translators, distinguished poets in their own right, have set for themselves a very high goal. They have tried, so far as possible, to reproduce their strange original not merely in effects of diction and style (where they prefer to remain close to the spirit rather than to the letter), but also in varying moods, and even in identical rhythms. Since the book has been praised, both here and in France, for achieving these ends, it is worth while to look into the matter.

The collaboration has a curious history, which Miss Millay sketches in her sparkling Preface. The conception was at first Mr. Dillon's; but he submitted some specimens of his work to the lady, who caught the fever and was soon translating on her own. Ultimately they shared the task almost equally. Seventy-two poems, about half of the usual canon of *Les Fleurs du Mal* (ed. of 1868, though not according to Crépet), are here presented. This includes nearly all the more notable poems, which appear both in French and English versions.

Miss Millay shows a good understanding of the difficulties, particularly those involved in conveying the effect of the French Alexandrine. To imitate this "proud full sail," the translators chose—in accordance with their resolution to preserve the "anatomy" of the original—neither our familiar pentameter, nor the classical hexameter, but that rare vehicle, the English six-foot iambic, with occasional anapests. To make this *sound* like the Alexandrine is indeed a task. But I believe that Miss Millay's approximation is on the whole closer than Mr. Dillon's. She is not only cleverer in spondaic substitutions, but she can shift the whole basis of the prosody from our foot-division to the syllabic stresses of the measured Alexandrine. Thus she reveals more dexterity in packing her hexameters with mouth-filling short words and slow-moving polysyllables in wise alteration. She is equally dexterous in rendering the shorter meters, as in "L'Invitation au Voyage." Mr. Dillon's heavily stressed measures are more jerky and staccato, although "Lesbos" is a fine exception. As a rule, it is the poetess who does better justice to Baudelaire's large and somber manner. An occasional slip in taste (*e. g.*, "You've a date in town," for "Pense à ton devoir"), or even a sin of omission, as where Mr. Dillon leaves out the "stone" in the figure of the Commander ("Don Juan aux Enfers"), may be forgiven. On the whole, Miss Millay's seems to be the dominating voice in the volume. Perhaps this is because there is no lack of those captivating, breath-taking lines whose peculiar quality is hers rather than her model's. She is also responsible for the brief presentation of Baudelaire's life, in a sort of scenario at the end of the volume.

E. PRESTON DARGAN

University of Chicago

Charles Kingsley and Thomas Hughes, First Editions (with a few exceptions) in the Library at Dormy House, Pine Valley, New Jersey, described with Notes by M. L. PARRISH with the assistance of BARBARA KELSEY MAUN. London: Constable and Company, 1936. Pp. xi + 166.

Probably nothing would have given those lifelong friends Charles Kingsley and Thomas Hughes greater pleasure than the appearance in a single volume of bibliographies of their complete works. The beauty and elegance of the form in which they have been clothed in this catalogue might have surprised them, but they would not have thought it unsuitable. Each of them wrote with an eye upon posterity.

To so high a point of perfection has Mr. M. L. Parrish brought his Victorian collection that a catalogue of first editions in the

Library of Dormy House amounts practically to a complete bibliography of the authors whom it treats. Like *Victorian Lady Novelists*, published in 1933, this *Charles Kingsley and Thomas Hughes* is no mere collector's pastime but a piece of genuine service to scholarship. No bibliography of Charles Kingsley exists and there is none of Thomas Hughes in book form. The descriptive information given here on each volume is elaborate and complete; the photographic illustrations of rare bindings and title-pages are sumptuous and interesting; few libraries have adequate representation of writers so addicted to tract and pamphlet publishing; and for the small number of items where his collection fails Mr. Parrish has added information in appendices. He has helpfully listed also the works of Thomas Hughes of Reading and Thomas Hughes of Market Rasen, both of whom, as Victorian students know to their cost, are easily confused with Thomas Hughes of Rugby. Of interest, too, are the descriptions of Kingsley's songs set to music by contemporary composers for contemporary singers.

Though Mr. Parrish lists all the issues of *Politics for the People* to which Kingsley contributed under the pseudonym of Parson Lot, he omits mention of the *Christian Socialist* for which Parson Lot wrote still more largely and which published, in July and August 1851, the story of "The Nun's Pool" which Ludlow thought too strong for *Politics*. Mr. Parrish is fortunate in possessing the rejected proof sheets corrected in Kingsley's hand.

Mr. Parrish describes a curious American publication *Laurel Leaves*, 1876, which contains Kingsley's poem "The Knight's Leap" (the title has several variants) and a note that Kingsley read it to the members of the Allston Club of Baltimore and that this is its first appearance in print. Mr. Parrish indicates that it was included in 1863 in *A Welcome*, a collection made in honor of the Princess Alexandra. As a matter of fact, it was published four years before that, January 1859, in *Fraser's Magazine*.

But such minor matters as these are the only lacks to be found in the very valuable work of a collector who loves his books with the mingled enthusiasm of a twentieth century bibliophile and a nineteenth century subscriber to Mudie's.

Princeton, New Jersey

MARGARET FARRAND THORP

Francis Thompson. By FREDERICO OLIVERO. Brescia Morcelliana, 1935. Pp. 281.

Professor Olivero's critique of Francis Thompson's poetry is exhaustive. It covers every aspect of his work, and gives due credit to the earlier investigations of Meynell, Beacock, and

Mégroz. But it shows certain limitations both of insight and of method. Professor Olivero accepts without qualification the nineteenth century type of Catholic mysticism espoused by Thompson and its interpretation of English literary tradition. But his lack of insight is in part that natural to a foreigner's inability to understand English idiom with native subtlety. He says, for instance (p. 85), that Thompson has the same extensive range of images as Shakespeare, which is probably correct. But it is apparent (p. 87) that he also believes their quality comparable, which is a different matter. He does not catch the shift from profound human meaning in Shakespeare's images to fantasy and dogmatism in Thompson's use of words. Here the true Elizabethan parallel would be a poet like Spenser, whose imagery, like Thompson's, springs consciously from literary tradition rather than the living use of language. In consequence Olivero feels at liberty to compare Shakespeare's "These burrs are in my heart" with Thompson's ". . . here I shake off The burr o' the world." He fails to realize that the figure has been transformed into a preposterous conceit. To a Catholic, certainly, this vast and sinful world ought not be regarded as so trifling an impediment. And the use of "o'" for "of" must to English ears increase the tone of frivolity and affectation. A more typical defect of Professor Olivero's insight is to be found on page 206, where Thompson's lines, "As an Arab journeyeth, Through a sand of Ayaman," are ascribed to the influence of Coleridge's "Like a lone Arab, old and blind, Some caravan had left behind." In these two verses there is no common element except the word "Arab," and hence it is scarcely plausible to find a true influence.

Professor Olivero's lack of insight in these interpretations is directly related to his scholarly method; and the mechanical nature of his method is the result of the peculiar logic of his mystical philosophy. The philosophical dualism he accepts between truth and expression makes for a dualism in methodology. Since ideas are approached mystically and their expression cannot be, the latter can only be analyzed independently and mechanically. The result is that Professor Olivero's most valuable chapter is the one on word-formations, which readily submit to a mechanical analysis. Otherwise his chapters, whatever their titles, have a way of repeating material. There is no reason for a special chapter on literary influences when these have already been considered as they have arisen in chapters on ideas and verse-forms. Nor would it ordinarily be thought justifiable to treat the poet's style in a chapter separate from that devoted to his images. At the same time the scholar who is not a mystic must find the philosophical chapters, such as those on Thompson's religion and conception of nature, too rhapsodic and uncritically sympathetic to be of much value. For Professor Olivero, in alluding to the influence of Wordsworth upon

Thompson, by no means clears away the ambiguities this influence introduced into Thompson's acceptance of Catholic theology.

New York University

EDWIN BERRY BURGUM

America Through the Short Story. Edited by N. BRYLLION FAGIN.

Boston: Little, Brown, 1936. Pp. x + 508. \$1.75.

Mr. Fagin's Introduction, "The Short Story as a Reflection of American Life," observes with concise thoroughness the danger of attempting to define the term short story, discusses with capability the origin and growth of the form from the request for brevity by Editor Sarah J. Hale 100 years ago, through the effect of international copyright law and lack of it, love of exchanging stories, on to the influence of the development of industrialism. With a clear eye Mr. Fagin watches the growth of the story through essay and abbreviated novel to the distinctive thing it is today, "a narrative form of beauty and power"; and he chooses capital illustrations for exemplifying this growth.

Since "of realistic portrayal of American life there is practically nothing in his fiction," Poe is omitted from the collection ranging from Benjamin Franklin to Martha Foley and Erskine Caldwell. Local colorists are represented and dismissed fairly enough with the pronouncement that the present American short story in the main keeps to the broad currents of our national life. This fact is indisputable: the short story, as one corollary, contributes to our national homogeneity. Particularly concerned with what the short story has had to tell us, rather than with technical problems, Mr. Fagin emphasizes it as a product of the "peculiar social forces which have shaped all of American life." Indian and negro, therefore, lead off the Table of Contents, followed by other Minority peoples, and three tales testifying to the place of woman; religion and war, labor and capital, and social classes further have determined the flowering of this literary plant. Indulge the figure: Mr. Fagin has gathered from the fields of the short story many varieties, dependent upon our racial evolution, an herbarium of scientific interest. Not a few of the later specimens are colorful and finely formed, contemporary flowering of this literary growth.

Time was overdue for a collection of stories edited not for technique but for substance and exemplification of the evolutionary process. Both student and general reader may be grateful to Mr. Fagin for his compactly elaborated, ably documented collection.

BLANCHE COLTON WILLIAMS

Hunter College of the City of New York

BRIEF MENTION

Bibliographies of twelve Victorian Authors. Compiled by THEODORE G. EHRSAM, and ROBERT H. DEILY, under direction of ROBERT M. SMITH. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1936. Pp 362. This work will be invaluable to students of the later Victorian period of English Literature. It assembles, under one cover, comprehensive bibliographies of Arnold, Mrs. Browning, Clough, Fitzgerald, Hardy, Kipling, Morris, Christina Rossetti, Stevenson, Swinburne and Tennyson. Several of these authors have never before received adequate bibliographical notice, and the remainder, who like Tennyson occupied a generous share of attention at the beginning of the century, badly needed to have bibliographical material concerning them brought up to date. Clough and Christina Rossetti, in particular, have been neglected.

The arrangement, if somewhat unorthodox, is convenient. Each bibliography is divided into three sections: a chronological outline of the author's main works, a list of bibliographical sources, a compendium of biographical and critical material. An unusual feature is the inclusion, under this third heading, of entries listing the first edition of the author's works by title, with a list of reviews of the book arranged under each title entry.

The compilers have consulted over two hundred sources in their efforts to collect material, and they have included bibliographical, biographical and critical articles in periodicals, pamphlets, essays and books in English and in foreign languages employing the Latin alphabet. The inclusion of unpublished masters' essays and doctoral dissertations, makes this book of added value to research workers in this field. While the work does not pretend to be exhaustive, its compilers claim to have provided information which will satisfy the requirements of the book collector, the scholar, the student and the librarian. Unfortunately time is the bibliographer's worst foe, and a bibliography ceases to be complete as soon as it is published. The recent death of Kipling will result in a new output of material, and the announcement of the unpublished works of William Morris edited by his daughter to be issued by Basil Blackwell, came too late to be included in this list. The compilers have not availed themselves of the complete resources of Nathan Van Patten's *Index to bibliographies relating to the works of American and British authors, 1923-32*. But on the whole their work has been exceptionally thorough, and this volume will be a distinctive addition to bibliographical literature.

Canti carnascialeschi del Rinascimento. A cura di CHARLES S. SINGLETON. Bari, Gius. Laterza & Figli, 1936. Pp. 498. Lire 40. (Scrittori d'Italia, 159.) Except for the *canti carnascialeschi* written by Lorenzo the Magnificent, already published in this series, this valuable material has been of difficult access to scholars, and only in manuscripts or uncritical editions. The vast labor of collecting these songs and establishing a critical text has heretofore discouraged students of the period, although its desirability and importance were long ago pointed out by B. Croce. It is therefore with especial gratitude that we welcome this 159th volume of Scrittori d'Italia, the second of the series to be edited by an American. Dr. Singleton has given us in a compact volume nearly three hundred of the most important carnival songs, many of which appear here for the first time in print. All of them show more or less important departures from the traditional text, and the sources used are listed and evaluated in an ingenious and clear table in the *Nota*. Very little seems to be known concerning the date of most of these songs or the pageant which they represent, but all information furnished by the manuscripts on the matter and much that is given in chronicles of the day has been included in the annotations. Not included in this volume are the songs by Lorenzo de' Medici, already available in a critical edition of this collection, those by Machiavelli, five in number, to appear later in the series, and numerous songs of lesser importance which, it is to be hoped, Dr. Singleton will see fit to edit at some later date along with the music of the *canti*, much of which is still unpublished. Historians of music will welcome the references here given to manuscripts furnishing musical notation. The usefulness and excellence of the present volume can only make us hope that its editor will give us some day the general study which we lack on the pageantry of Florence, including the still unpublished songs, with music, illustrations showing costumes and *décor*, and extended discussion of the part played by songs and pageant in the life of the city during the Renaissance.

CHANDLER B. BEALL

University of Oregon

La Gerusalemme liberata nella Inghilterra di Spenser By ALBERTO CASTELLI. Milano: Società Editrice "Vita e Pensiero," 1936. Pp. xii + 130. Lire 10. (Pubblicazioni della Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore. Serie Quarta: Scienze filologiche, Vol. xx.) The first chapter points out the varied and continuous literary exchanges between England and Italy, mentioning the most important works on the subject and emphasizing the popularity of Tasso immediately after the publication of the *Gerusalemme liberata* in 1584. The second chapter sums up Spenser's

debt to Tasso in the *Faerie Queen*, and the three final chapters discuss Tasso's influence on Spenser's contemporaries and followers, the English translations of the *Gerusalemme*, and the judgments of English critics on the poem. The author seems to have added little to what was already known on the subject, but he has collected in a single convenient volume information scattered through various journals and books, and has shown Tasso's important though not predominant position among the Italian authors who influenced English writers of the period. It was of course impossible for him to utilize the unpublished dissertation (Northwestern University, 1933) by H. M. Priest on *Tasso and English Literature, 1575-1675*; but even an examination of the all too brief printed summary (*Summaries of Dissertations*, Northwestern University, 1933, Vol. 1) would have furnished indications of further borrowings in Spenser. A more serious oversight was the failure to consult the articles of Dodge and Bullock in *PMLA*, 1929 and 1930, on the Italian texts used by Carew and Fairfax for their translations; Castell's examination of the various possible texts was evidently incomplete and hasty, and his conclusions incorrect. In fact, all the chapters of this study, while quite useful as far as they go, leave the impression that they might have gone considerably farther. Even the proof-reading was hastily done, and many misprints remain to mar the pages.

CHANDLER B. BEALL

University of Oregon

Les Imitations de l'Arioste de P. Desportes. Par AL. CIORĂNESCU. Vălenii-de-Munte, Imprimerie Datina Românească, 1936. (Reprinted from the *Mélanges de l'Ecole roumaine en France*, XII, same place and year). Mr. C.'s title is misleading. He treats, in a pamphlet of 83 double-spaced pages, not only the *Imitations de l'Arioste*, but also the *Diane*, the *Hippolyte*, the *Cléonice* and the *Diverses Amours* as they show imitation of the *Orlando* or the *Liriche*. Most of this material has been compiled from other sources; Mr. C.'s few original touches are not happy ones. Thus certain lines on the eagle and its young (Desportes, *Contre un Juif*, "L'aigle léger" etc.), which C. believes to be imitated from Ariosto's sonnet "Perche simili siano," show closer resemblance to a more popular and hence more probable source, Serafino Aquilano's "L'aquila che col sguardo" (Ed. Menghini, Sonnet I). Of Ariosto's satire on marriage (*Da tutti gli altri amici*) as a possible source of Desportes' *Stances du mariage*, C. says (p. 13): "On ne saurait affirmer que cette dernière soit le modèle de Desportes"; and on the following page: "Il y a toutefois des rapprochements qui permettent de voir qu'il eut devant les yeux cette pièce, au moment où il composait ses *Stances*, et qu'il lui emprunta au moins

quelques détails." He does not mention the *Misogame* of Jamyn, a poem so closely related to the *Stances* in content and time and place of composition that they ought not to be discussed without reference to it. Neither does he consider that all the points against a rich wife, a poor one, a pretty or a homely one, which he attributes to Ariosto, were commonplaces of the time, and might just as well have come from the *Controverses* of Gratian Du Pont (1534), the *Sylvae Nuptiales* of Giovanni Nevizzani (1521), or a host of earlier misogynics listed by these two and including Jean de Meung's *Roman de la Rose* (II, ll. 8561 sqq.). The *Stances* and the *Satire* show some likeness; but there is no particular reason for believing that the resemblance between them is other than coincidental.

ALICE CAMERON

Maryland College for Women

The Best Plays of Racine, translated into English rhyming verse with introductions, notes, by LACY LOCKERT. Princeton: Princeton Press, 1936. xii + 412 pp. \$3.00. By the "best" plays are meant *Andromaque*, *Britannicus*, *Phèdre*, and *Athalie*. *Bérénice* would have had more appeal for the British and American public, but, when the translator undertook his work, he could not have foreseen that the modern Titus would give up the Empire for his Berenice just as the book was leaving the press. The translation seems to be about as faithful to Racine's meaning as a verse translation can be, but it does not properly reproduce Racine's purity of form, for Mr. L. deliberately uses many run-on lines and many imperfect rimes (truth: oath; glance: hence; through: flow, etc.). A similar criticism can be made of the artificial flavor produced by the use of the antiquated second and third persons singular of English verbs and of such words as *e'er*, *wildering*, *empery*, etc. The appealing simplicity of the original disappears. In his notes and prefaces Mr. L. repeats a good many familiar criticisms and adds a number of his own that are interesting and suggestive, though they hardly do justice to the characters of *Andromaque* and *Hippolyte*. However, if one hasn't enough French to turn to Racine himself, one can hardly do better than to read Mr. L.'s translation.

H. C. LANCASTER

Trübners Deutsches Wörterbuch, Im Auftrag der Arbeitsgemeinschaft für deutsche Wortforschung herausgegeben von ALFRED GÖRZE. Erste Lieferung: *A-Alpe*; Zweite Lieferung (Bd. 3, Lfg. 1): *O-patzig*; Dritte Lieferung (Bd. 3, Tl. 2, Lfg. 1): *S-schicklich*; Berlin und Leipzig, 1936, 1937, Walter de Gruyter &

Co. RM. 1 per fascicle. The scope of the new dictionary is given as follows:

Trübners Deutsches Wörterbuch . . . will in vier Bänden auf insgesamt 160 Bogen unsern lebenden Wortschatz in wissenschaftlich einstuften und einwandfreien Wortgeschichten darstellen, die in jeder Zeile faßlich geschrieben sein und jede ermüdende Breite vermeiden sollen. Bei schärfster Raumausnutzung will das Werk den deutschen Wortschatz nicht erschöpfen, sondern in gewissenhafter Auslese die sprachgeschichtlich anziehenden und kulturgeschichtlich bedeutsamen Wortgeschichten ausheben. Mit Belegen soll das Werk nicht überlastet sein, doch werden durch streng gewählte Zeugnisse alle Angaben belebt und Wendepunkte im Leben der Wörter beleuchtet.

The three fascicles that have so far appeared bear out these claims. The citations are ample, and what is more, are documented by foot-notes to each article, with exact references giving volume and page of the source quoted. This is not always the case with the *Etymologisches Wörterbuch* of Kluge-Gotze, published by the same firm. Foreign words are adequately treated; compare: *Organ*, *Orgel*, *Parole*, *Partner*, *Paste*, *Paß*, *Patron* in fascicle 2.

When completed, the new dictionary will contain four volumes, each of approximately 640 large quarto pages, or about twice the bulk of the hitherto indispensable Weigand-Hirt, long out of print. The price, M. 40 for the entire work, is extremely low, and should attract every one interested in the history of the German *Wortschatz*.

W. K.

Deutsche Studien, Vorträge und Ansprachen von Professor Dr. FRITZ BEHREND, Wissenschaftlicher Beamter der Preuß. Akademie der Wissenschaften a. D. 1936. Hermann Wendt G. m. b. H., Berlin. M. 2.50. In this volume of 132 pages the author of the *Geschichte der deutschen Philologie in Bildern* has collected a number of addresses and essays, for the most part published in various journals and pamphlets. The introductory essay is entitled: "Geschichtswissenschaft und Germanistik"; this is followed by "Die deutsche Literatur im Elsass"; "Die Anfänge der Universität Krakau"; "Trajano Boccalini und die deutsche Literatur"; "Martin Opitz als Neuerer"; "Theodor Storm und seine Heimat"; "Über Soldatenromane aus der Vorkriegszeit"; "Reise nach Holland und Belgien." The interesting and at the same time moderately priced book is well worth reading.

W. K.

Seasons and Months, Studies in a Tradition of Middle English Poetry. By ROSEMOND TUVE. Paris: Librairie Universitaire S. A., 1933. Pp. 232 with Prefatory Note. Conventional formulae in Middle English descriptions of people, personifications, and scenery,

have long been noted, analyzed, and classified, and now traditional accounts of the seasons and months are added to the list, showing the vast amount of trite expression available to writers of the time and revealing the true originality of those who borrowing this material modified it by giving it life. Miss Tuve has covered a large field in her reading, and finds that her material derives from one or more of several lines of development: the Classical tradition, the semi- or pseudo-scientific, the rhetorical, the French Courtly, and the artistic. These she investigates with patience, although as she aptly remarks, "one cannot hope to be exhaustive when one deals with centuries of 'singing birds.'"¹ In many ways her work is most illuminating, with an abundance of examples and informed discussion, especially the chapter on the *Secreta Secretorum* and the later section on the seasons motif in art. I cannot help wondering whether a greater use could not have been made of the material in manuscript illuminations with special reference to garden scenes and detail there appropriate for descriptions of spring and summer in the French Courtly tradition. The book badly needs an introductory chapter as well as an index, deficiencies for which the elaborate summary in the Table of Contents does not atone. I have noted a few cases where the best editions are not cited, as in the instance of Prudentius (Allen and Jones, *Romanesque Lyric*, should not be cited for the text); that of Walafriid Strabo (Manitius and Raby are referred to for *De imagine Tetrici*). For the *Pervigilium Veneris* see Rand, *Trans. Amer. Philol. Assoc.*, LXV (1934), 1-12. The documentation leaves something to be desired and is not in every case related to the Bibliography, which omits the *Anticlaudianus*, Bernardus Sylvester, and Walafriid Strabo (whose works are found in the *Poetae Latini*, but cf. the listing of Paulinus of Nola). Yet despite certain flaws of this kind, this is a useful work, and one for which all scholars in the field will be grateful.

H. R. PATCH

Smith College

The Problem of Wineland. By HALLDÓR HERMANNSSON. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1936. Pp. 5 + 84 + 2. (Islandica, Vol. 25.) In the present essay Professor Hermannsson once more returns to the problem of Wineland, reviewing the question of the sources and their value in the light of the latest researches. Few contemporary writers could master the immense literature on the subject in the way H. does it, and most would be in more danger of submersion in details than he is. Already in 1909 when H. issued his bibliography of the subject: *The Northmen in America*

¹ Page 36.

(*Islandica*, vol. 2), he called attention to the fact that scholars best acquainted with the Old Icelandic literature, like Gustav Storm and Finnur Jónsson, agreed in giving preference to the version of these narratives that is found in *Hauksbók*, rather than to the one preserved in the later *Flateyjarbók*. This view, shared by the last editor of the sagas, *Matthías Þórðarson* (*Íslenzk Fornrit*, vol. iv), is also adopted by H. in the present study. In general he believes that the story of *Hauksbók* must be founded on facts transmitted to a writing posterity by a reliable family tradition; this he tries to prove in a detailed survey of the saga. As to Karlsefni's route, he still entertains the views set forth by himself in an article in the *Geographical Review* (1927, xvii, pp. 107-114) and with good reason, for other theories are certainly not more plausible. After discussing the sources and the geographical aspect of the problem he adds two interesting chapters on "Alleged Norse Remains and Influences on the American Continent" and "Effects of the Discovery of Vineland," in both cases reaching a negative conclusion. He rightly refuses to believe in the genuineness of the American Runic Monuments (notably the Kensington Stone) and he finds nothing to corroborate the view, sometimes advanced, that Columbus had learned about America in Iceland. Altogether the book is an excellent, if somewhat conservative, statement of the problem as it appears today; it can be wholeheartedly recommended to everybody, lay and learned alike, interested in these always fascinating questions.

STEFÁN EINARSSON

The Johns Hopkins University

The Education of Chaucer. By GEORGE A. PLIMPTON. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1935. Pp. 176. \$2.00. The more we come to know of Chaucer the more it appears that the old antiquarians of the sixteenth century were nearer right than the modern and sceptical Lounsbury in their praise of Chaucer's learning. He was not, indeed, a graduate of both universities, or of either one of them; and he was not by union standards of that day or of this a scholar. But he was a man of a range of knowledge to put many scholars to shame, and if he was not always accurate to the letter, he knew what it was worth and how to use it.

Much water has flowed under the bridge since Lounsbury wrote. Kittredge, Lowes, Manly, Curry, Shannon, and many others, have added to our store of knowledge concerning Chaucer's learning and the sources of it: not the least valuable was an article by Miss Rickert some years ago (*Modern Philology*, xxix, 257-274. February 1932) on "Chaucer at School," with its catalogue of the books of William de Ravenstone bequeathed in 1358 to the library

of St. Paul's school, at which, it is natural to suppose, Chaucer was a pupil.

The late Mr. Plimpton in this beautiful little book does not pretend to give an account of Chaucer's schooling. He gives us rather, as in his *Education of Shakespeare*, a brief sketch of the departments of knowledge in the late Middle Ages, the stages which a student, man and boy, kept on his way toward mastering them, the authors he studied and the books he read. All this we knew before: Mr. Plimpton's rare contribution is that he is able to illustrate these books—at least an astonishing number of them—from manuscripts on his own shelves. The forty-seven superb plates, well chosen and beautifully reproduced, bring us closer than mere titles ever can to Geoffrey Chaucer in the schoolroom or, in later life, poring over his books late at night till "fully daswed" was his look. Medievalists, Chaucerians, and students of the history of education may not learn here much that they did not know before, but they must be even duller than usual if their imaginations are not strangely quickened. One may hope that they are not also collectors: if they are, their feelings had better not be described.

M. B. RUUD

University of Minnesota

Old English Elegies. By CHARLES W. KENNEDY. Princeton: Univ. Press, 1936. Pp. x + 104. \$2.00. This is a volume of translations. Six poems of the Exeter Book (*Wanderer*, *Seafarer*, *Ruin*, *Deor*, *Wife's Lament*, *Husband's Message*) and lines 2231-70 of *Beowulf* are put into modern English alliterative verse that happily combines high poetic quality and faithfulness to the originals. An Introduction of 41 pages paints for the uninformed a brief but adequate background. The book ends with a selected bibliography of six pages. The translator is to be congratulated on a piece of work well done. I add a few comments on the introductory material. Pp. 8, 25: it is unfortunate that the OE digraph æ was not used; it is surely to be had at the printer's, without extra cost. P. 11: the use of *Christian* here and elsewhere is unhappy, if 'religious' is meant (as it seems to be). If the author had in mind the contrast of Christian and pagan (rather than religious and secular), I cannot agree with him. Again, the conversion postulated on pp. 15 and 17 may be accepted if by *conversion* the author means what is meant by it today; if however he has in mind conversion from Germanic paganism, this must be rejected as wholly improbable—the English were a Christian nation when the *Seafarer* was composed. P. 24: it is wrong to say that "*Deor* is essentially a heathen poem." That it draws on heroic legend for

its matter does not make it heathen. P. 36: the juxtaposition of "Old English" and "Scandinavian" is odd, consistency calls for "Old Scandinavian" or, better, for a simple "English."

K. M.

Bristols Bedeutung für die Englische Romantik und die Deutsch-Englischen Beziehungen. By CARL AUGUST WEBER. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1935. Pp. xvi + 304. RM. 12.50. (*Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, LXXXIX). The state of affairs treated here is the existence of a city which has always been "by trade and dulness consecrate to fame." Once trade implied the naval and pioneering spirit: in the eighteenth century merchant life was accompanied only by Nonconformity and its political interests, and tempered by the activity of a spa in an agreeable landscape and by a continued self-consciousness in the local literary production. The problem is to examine the conditioning for good or ill exerted by such a tradition and environment, and to distinguish to what extent the particularistic feelings of the intelligentsia are materially grounded. Just as the description of events coming one after another in time does not constitute a history, so literary geography has no unity but what is conferred by the finding of causal relationships. If imaginative literature is in the same case with words, which (p. 51) "'in their own nature are only arbitrary signs of ideas . . . and consequently can be no part of real knowledge, or a proper subject for reasoning,'" then the substructure of *Realien* must be abstracted from the 'purely literary' element (pp. xii-xiv, 57). But Dr. Weber diplomatically limits his book for the most part to a detailed account of the ramifications of intellectual life in Bristol, and tries to hide with learning what is lost in unity and grasp.

Its other theme is afforded by the German interests of Dr. T. Beddoes and Coleridge in science and metaphysics, and by the student days of T. L. Beddoes at Göttingen and Würzburg ('Ausklang und Selbstauflösung der Bristoler Romantik'). There is, besides the appendix listing the book-borrowings and police record of T. L. Beddoes, a reprint (pp. 278-87) of German political articles of his, an abundant bibliography and portraits of Coleridge, Dr. T. Beddoes and T. L. Beddoes.

OWEN E. HOLLOWAY

Cairo, Egypt

The Complaint of Henry Duke of Buckingham, Including the Induction, or Thomas Sackville's Contribution to the Mirror for Magistrates. Edited, from the Author's MS., with Introduction, Notes, and Collation . . . by MARGUERITE HEARSEY. (Yale Studies

in English, LXXXVI.) New Haven: For the Yale University Press, 1936. Pp. xii + 140. Paper, \$2.00; cloth, \$2.50. In this edition of the "Induction," Professor Hearsey gives us a variant text from an unpublished manuscript in St. John's College, Cambridge. The manuscript, which is in two hands, permits the editor to make some interesting speculations on which hand is the poet's. As she is also inclined to believe that this manuscript is the one from which the first edition was printed, she is able to make some further ingenious deductions in support of this view. Her introduction includes a new life of Sackville in which she adds a few new facts to the accepted biography. The commentary on the text is perhaps too diffuse and draws too much from secondary sources.

DON CAMERON ALLEN

State College of Washington

Ireland Through Tudor Eyes. By EDWARD M. HINTON. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1935. Pp. xii + 111. \$2.00. Mr. Hinton has selected what he regards as typical or significant passages from the writings of members of six groups of young Englishmen whom fate or ambition led to Ireland between 1568 and 1616. These are interwoven in a shrewd running commentary on Irish culture and Anglo-Irish relations and illustrated by three plates from Derricke's *Image of Ireland* and a sixteenth-century map. A readable survey, the book is not to be relied on in detail by reason of typographical or other inaccuracies in dates, etc. *Sir Philip Sidney's Ourania* should be dated 1606 as on page 56 and not 1602 as on page 55; Spenser and Raleigh were together in 1589 (not 1598, as on page 55); Spenser's *View* was not published in 1592, as the reader of page 44 might think; and Spenser does not advocate extermination of the Irish, as one might be led to suppose; on the contrary, he calls for the extirpation of the evils of Irish government and society as a means of preserving the population. Mr. Hinton is to be commended for his keenness in interpreting the evidence that Barnaby Rich is the author of *Greenes Newes both from Heaven and Hell* and for his industry in bringing to scholarly attention the holograph MS of Rich's *Anothomy of Irelande*.

JAMES G. McMANAWAY

Folger Shakespeare Library

Cognition and Volition in Language. By H. MULDER. Groningen: J. B. Wolters, 1936. Pp. vi + 208. Dr. Mulder is interested in what might be called "the psychology of speech" as a basis of linguistic instruction. He is anxious to know whether

human beings in the acquisition of a language use their intellects or their wills or both. His conclusion is "that the will and the intellect, as united in the ego, act in indissoluble partnership in the production of speech, but that the cognitional is always in the lead" (p. 23). This conclusion is reached not only by a study of children and adults learning a foreign language but of children learning also their mother tongue. Reduced to plain terms this would seem to mean that a person has to know the meaning of words before he can use them and that consequently there is no sense in trying to teach language by mere imitation of a teacher's vocal noises. How novel this thesis is to language teachers this reviewer has no means of knowing, but surely no one outside that field would ever dispute it. At the same time he has made certain rough observations that would lead him to believe in the greater linguistic gifts of children, whose intellects after all are not usually the equal of adults'. Why a child can in a few weeks learn to talk in a foreign tongue which his parents are still stuttering with shame and confusion is left unexplained by this always learned, if somewhat one-sided, book. And if it were explained, it might be at least possible that something called "self-consciousness" was not without influence in an individual's ability to learn a new tongue.

GEORGE BOAS

The Johns Hopkins University

English Poetry of the Seventeenth Century. Selected and edited by ROBERTA FLORENCE BRINKLEY. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1936. Pp. xiv + 584. \$2.75. Professor Brinkley's volume is so unpretentious that at first glance it seems to be merely a collection of poems. To be sure, it has a short but carefully selected bibliography, an index, and some footnotes; but nowhere is there a parade of learning. The text is not a "scholarly" one. On the contrary, Miss Brinkley has prepared it "for the reader inexperienced in the oddities of seventeenth century form." Even a casual glance shows that the anthology is the most complete collection of poetry limited to the seventeenth century which is available, but only a careful reading of the introductory essay and the short biographies of the poets reveals how much scholarship has gone into the editing of the volume. The essay is only twenty pages long, but it contains the gist of many learned volumes. The reviewer knows of no other monograph which gives so complete a summary of the history of ideas of the seventeenth century as does this short introductory essay.

WALTER G. FRIEDRICH

Valparaiso University

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The English list includes only books received]

Baker, E. A.—The History of the English Novel (Brontës to Meredith) *London*: Witherby, 1937. Pp. 411 16 s.

Brown, Leonard.—Modern short stories *New York*: Harcourt, Brace, 1937. Pp vi + 676 \$125

Castelli, A.—La Gerusalemme liberata nella Inghilterra di Spenser *Milano*: "Vita e pensiero," 1936 Pp xii + 130 L 10

Currier, T. F.—A bibliog. of J G Whittier. *Cambridge*: Harvard U. Press, 1937 Pp xviii + 693 \$8 00

Darbishire, Helen (ed.).—Essays and Studies by members of the Eng. Ass XXII *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [N. Y.: Oxford Press], 1937. Pp 158 \$275.

Gerould, G. H.—How to read fiction *Princeton*: Princeton U. Press, 1937. Pp 153 \$150

Gray and Collins.—Poems, ed A L Poole 3rd ed revised *London* [and N Y]: Oxford U Press, 1937 Pp. 328

Kleineke, W.—Englische Fürstenspiegel vom Policratus Johannis von Salisbury bis zum Bailikon Doron Konig Jakobs I *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1937 Pp. 223. RM 9

Loomis, R. S. and Motter, V.—Models for writing prose *New York*: Farrar & Rinehart, 1937. Pp xii + 650 \$2 00

Partridge, E.—A Dictionary of Slang and unconventional English. *New York*. Macmillan, 1937 Pp 999 \$12 50

S. P. E. Tract XLVIII: Jespersen, Linguistic self-criticism; W. A Graigie, Irregularities of Eng. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [N Y.: Oxford Press], 1937 Pp 23.

Schurmer, W F.—Geschichte der englischen Lit I. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1937. Pp 80 RM 2.

Sen, Amiyakumar.—Studies in Shelley. *Calcutta*: U. of Calcutta, 1936 Pp. xvi + 343.

Shankwar, Bhawani.—Studies in Mod. Eng. Poetry *Allahabad*: Students' Friends, 1936. Pp xii + 279

Walpole, Hugh (ed.).—Essays by Divers Hands. *London* [and N Y]: Oxford U. Press, 1936. Pp xx + 202.

GERMAN

Aurora. — Ein romantischer Almanach. Jahresgabe der Deutschen Eichendorff-Stiftung. Hrsg. von Karl Sczodrok. *Oppeln*:

Verl. "Der Oberschlesier," 1937. 148 pp. 6 plates. M. 3.

Betz, Irene.—Der Tod in der deutschen Dichtung des Impressionismus. Diss. *Tübingen*. *Wurzburg*: Triltsch, 1937. 173 pp.

Bock, Hans-Joachim.—Grundzuge von Wilhelm Raabes Weltanschauung und Kunst aufgewiesen an den "Alten Nestern." [Deutsche Studien zur Geistesgeschichte. H 3 Diss. Bonn]. *Wurzburg*: Triltsch, 1937 86 pp M 2 50

Bucher, Jakob.—Die Flurnamen des Dorfs Wörstadt in Rheinhessen [Aus: Hess. Flurnamenbuch H 11 Diss Giessen]. *Giessen*: von Munchow, 1936 58 pp.

Cammerer, Heinrich. — R. M Rilkes Duineser Elegien Deutung der Dichtung. *Stuttgart*: Metzler, 1937. vii, 151 pp. M 4.50.

Dahlberg, Torsten: Göttingisch-Grubenhagensche Studien [Lunds Universitets Årsskrift N F Avd 1, Bd 32, Nr 2] *Lund*: C W. K Gleerup, 1937 96 pp 4°.

Geissler, Ewald.—Vom deutschen Stil. Lockrufe und Warnungen [Meyers Text-Bändchen 5] *Leipzig*: Bibliogr. Institut [1937]. 82 pp 90 Pf.

Grolman, Adolf von.—Werk und Wirklichkeit Drei Kapitel vom dichterischen Schaffen. Johann Peter Hebel, Emil Göt., Hans Thoma. *Berlin*: Junker u Dünhaupt, 1937. 210 pp. M 6.

Hempel, H.—Gotisches Elementarbuch. Grammatik, Texte mit Übers u. Erl [Sammlung Götschen 79] *Berlin*: de Gruyter, 1937 136 pp. M 1.62

Hock, Erich.—Das Schmerzerlebnis und sein Ausdruck in Grillparzers Lyrik Diss *München* [Germanische Studien. H. 187]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1937. 274 pp M. 10.40

Keesenberg, H.—Die Flurnamen von Wilhelmsburg, Neuhof und Kattwiek-Hohe Schaar. [Aus: Wilhelmsburger Zeitung, Nov-Dez 1936]. *Harburg-Wilhelmsburg*: [1936], Schütthe, 39 pp

Kindermann, Heinz.—Dichtung und Volkheit Grundzüge einer neuen Literaturwissenschaft *Berlin*: Junker u Dünhaupt, 1937. ix, 95 pp M. 3.50.

Natau, Otto.—Mundart und Siedelung im nordöstlichen Ostpreußen [Schriften der Albertus-Univ Geisteswiss. Reihe Bd 4]. *Königsberg*: Ost-Europa-Verl. 1937. vii, 308 pp. M 10 50.

Neuse, Werner — Wege zur deutschen Kultur. A cultural Reader *Chicago*: J. B Lippincott Co. [1937] x, 252 pp.

Paul, Jean.—Sämtliche Werke. Hist.-krit. Ausgabe. Hrsg von der Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. in Verb mit der Akad. zur wissenschaftl. Erforschung und zur Pflege des

Deutschtums Abt. 1 Zu Lebzeiten des Dichters erschienene Werke, Bd. 12 Freiheits-Buchlein. Levana. Eig Bl zur Levana Weimar: Bohlau, 1937 xiii, 478 pp M. 25 65

Peine, Martin.—Das politisch-historische Drama von 1923 bis 1933 Diss Greifswald Berlin. Tritsch & Huther, 1936 232 pp

Rassmann, Joseph.—Das dramatische Schaffen Levin Schuckings. [Mit Auswertung unbekannter Bühnenmanuskriptdrucke u unveröffentlichter Hss Diss Breslau] Ohlau, Schlesien: Eschenhagen [1937]. 98 pp.

Renn, Gerhard.—Die Bedeutung des Namens "Pommern" und die Bezeichnungen für das heutige Pommern in der Geschichte [Greifswalder Abhandlungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 8=Diss Greifswald] Greifswald: Bamberg, 1937. 113 pp. M. 3 60.

Schneider, Hermann.—Über die ältesten Götterlieder der Nordgermanen [Sitzungsber d Bayer. Akad d Wiss Phil-hist Abt Jg 1936, H 7] München: C H Beck in Komm., 1936. 54 pp M. 3 40

Sengle, Friedrich.—Goethes Verhältnis zum Drama. Die theoretischen Bemerkungen im Zusammenhang mit seinem dramatischen Schaffen. Diss. Tübingen [Neue deutsche Forschungen. Abt Neuere deutsche Literaturgeschichte Bd 9 = Bd. 116 der Gesamtreihe]. Berlin: Junker u. Dunnhaupt, 1937 131 pp. M. 5.80

Seuffert, Thea von.—Venedig im Erlebnis deutscher Dichter [Ital. Studien 2 = Diss München]. Köln: Petrarca-Haus, 1937. 190 pp M. 3.60.

Szadowsky, Manfred.—Aus dem Leben der Gebirgsmundarten. [Aus. Die Alpen, 1936. H. 9 u 11]. Bern: Stampfli, 1936. 14 pp. 4°

Walzel, Oskar.—Florenz in deutscher Dichtung. [Veröffentlichungen des Petrarca-Hauses. Reihe 1, 31. Köln: Petrarca-Haus, 1937 49 pp. M 1 80.

Wehrli, Max.—Johann Jakob Bodmer und die Geschichte der Literatur. Diss. Zürich [Wege zur Dichtung Bd 27]. Leipzig: Huber, 1936. 163 pp. M. 3.60.

Werner, Otto Hermann.—Der Saarbergmann in Sprache und Brauch Köln: 1934. 116 pp.

Wezel, Emil.—Otto Heuschele. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der jüngeren schwäbischen Dichtung. Stuttgart: Strecker & Schröder, 1937. 60 pp. M. 2.

Wild, J. Henry.—An Introduction to Scientific German. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1937. vi, 116 pp. \$1.50.

—An Anthology of Scientific German.

New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1937. xiii, 286 pp \$1 05

Wittig, Lisbeth.—Der junge Friedrich Hebbel als Gestalter seines Selbst. Diss Berlin [Germanische Studien H 188] Berlin: Ebering, 1937 108 pp M 4 80

Wolf, Werner.—Rainer Maria Rilkes Duneser Elegien Eine Textdeutung Heidelberg: Winter, 1937 47 pp M 1 50

FRENCH

Arbellot, S.—Ch Maurias, homme d'action Paris Denoel et Steele, 1937 120 pp Fr. 6.

Balzac.—Père Goriot, éd. L. Vincent Paris: Hatier, 1935 128 pp Fr 1 50

Barante, P. de—Notes généalog et biog. sur la famille des Bugère, barons de Barante, 1534-1936. Paris: Vaucher, 1936 95 pp

Beaurepaire, G. de—Deux Normands, L. Bouilhet, P. Corneille Rouen. Larné, 1936 22 pp.

Beguin, A.—Géard de Neval Paris: Stock, 1937. 142 pp Fr 10

Blessebois, P.-C.—La Corneille de Mlle de Scay, éd. F. Lachèvie Paris Lachèvie, 40, rue Beaujon, 1937 61 pp Fr 20

Bremont, H.—Autom de l'humanisme d'Erasme à Pascal, préf de G. Govau 3° éd Paris. Grasset, 1936 303 pp Fr 16 50

Brenner, C. D.—Le Développement du proverbe dramatique en Fr. et sa vogue au XVIII^es, avec un prov inédit de Carmontelle Berkeley: U of Cal. Press, 1937 56 pp (U of C. Pubs., 20 (1).)

Bron, L.—Huysmans Paris: Ed. Alsatia, 1937. 127 pp Fr 13 50

Carman, J. N.—The Relationship of the *Perlesvaus* and the *Queste del Saint Graal* U of Chicago diss, rep. from Bull U. of Kansas, July, 1936 90 pp

Chapman, Cons, Levensgood, and Vreeland.—Anthol of seventeenth cent Fr lit Princeton: Princeton U Press, 1937 413 pp \$2.50.

—Anthol of eighteenth cent. Fr lit. *Ibid.*, 1937 529 pp \$3 00.

Charlier, G.—Aspects de Lamartine. Paris: Ed Albert, 1937 210 pp. Fr 12.

Eichelberg, W.—Dichtung u Wahrheit in Machauts "Voir Dit" Frankfurt diss, 1935 134 pp.

Fénelon.—Fables, éd. A. Cherel. Paris: Hatier, 1936. 112 pp. Fr. 1.50.

Flaubert.—Mme Bovary, éd. L. Languier. 2v. Paris: Briffaut, 1936. x + 352 pp. Fr. 100.

Flottes, P.—Le drame intérieur de Loti. Paris: Courrier politique, 1937. 268 pp. Fr. 15.

Hoffmann, K.—Themen der franz. Lyrik im 12 u. 13 Jhr. Bonn diss., 1936. 208 pp.

Hubener, E.—Der höfische Roman des franz. Rokoko. Greifswald diss., 1936. 131 pp.

Huguet, A.—Le poète V. Voiture et l'héritage maternel. Amiens: Yvert, 1936. 59 pp.

Droz, Eugénie.—Le MS des Plaintes d'Acante de Tristan l'Hermite. Paris: 25, rue de Tournon, 1937. 26 pp.

Kilgour, R. L.—The Decline of Chivalry as shown in the Fr. lit. of the late Middle Ages. Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1937. xxiv + 431 pp. (Harv. St. in Romance.)

Krakowski, E.—Deux poètes de l'héroïsme. Péguet et Wyspiński. Paris. Attinger, 1937. 64 pp. Fr. 10.

Krauss, W.—Corneille als polit. Dichter. Marburg: Ebel, 1936. 60 pp.

La Fontaine.—Fables choisies, éd. F. Gohin. Paris: Hatier, 1935. 112 pp. Fr. 1.50.

Lancaster, H. C.—Five French Farces, 1655-1694? Critical ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1937. 141 pp. \$1.25. (J. H. St. in Romance, 29.)

Lapérouse.—Voyage sur les côtes de l'Alaska et de la Californie (1786), éd. G. Chinard. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1937. liv + 144 pp. \$3.00. (Inst. fr. de Washington, 10.)

Lebbin, E.—A de Vignys Beziehungen zu England u. zur engl. Lit. Halle diss., 1936. 115 pp.

Maupassant.—Œuvres complètes, éd. R. Duménil. T. 3. Paris: Libr. de la Fr., 1936. ii + 445 pp. Fr. 50.

Munn, K. M.—A Contrib. to the study of Jean Lemaire de Belges. A critical study of Bio-bibliog. Data. Columbia diss., 1936. 216 pp.

Pompeati, A.—Vita di Victor Hugo. Milano: A. Corticelli, 1936. 289 pp. L. 12.

Rameaud, M.—Quelques poètes foréziens contemporains. Saint-Etienne: Ploton et Chave, 1937. 225 pp. Fr. 15.

Rheinfelder, H.—Altfranz. Gram. I: Lautlehre. Munich: Huebner, 1937. xv + 323 pp.

Saint-Germès, M.—Balzac, historien du droit. Paris: Nizet et Bastard, 1936. 219 pp. Fr. 50.

Samsami, N. D.—L'Iran dans la litt. fr. Paris: Presses univ., 1937. 206 pp. Fr. 26.

Sardou.—Théâtre complet VIII. Paris: Michel, 1936. 661 pp. Fr. 20.

Spalikowski, E.—Maupassant à Etretat. Rouen: Lainé, 1936. 14 pp.

Sprimont, Ch. de.—La Rose et l'épée, poèmes, 1898-1903, éd. M. Dullaert. Liège: Vaillant-Carmanne, 1936. 126 pp.

Thureau, E.—"Galant," ein Beitrag zur franz. Wort- u. Kulturgeschichte. Frankfurt: Diesterweg, 1936. 113 pp.

Turcotte, S.-J.—Les Gens d'affaires sur la scène fr. de 1870 à 1914. Diss. Paris: Nizet et Bastard, 1936. 226 pp.

Ungern-Sternberg, R. von.—Frankreich. Lebensraum u. Wesen. Berlin: Stilke, 1937. 132 pp.

Wheatley and Swanson.—A Review of Fr. Grammar. New York: Macmillan, 1937. xiv + 281 pp.

Wicke, B.—Stilprobleme bei Stendhal. Zurich diss., 1936. 67 pp.

Wille, H. J.—Traume u. Tränen. Das Leben der Thérèse Levasseur mit J.-J. Rousseau. Leipzig: Gunther, 1936. 579 pp.

ITALIAN

Aretino, Pietro.—Le più belle pagine, ed. M. Bontempelli. Milano: F.lli Treves, 1936. 305 pp. L. 8.

Ariosto.—Orlando Furioso, ed. I. Tomi. Alba: Pia soc. S. Paolo, 1935. xxxvii + 191 pp. L. 6.

Barberino, S. E.—Note e appunti su poeti calabresi e loro interpreti. Il Preterà nel libro d'Acquaro. Parte I. A cura di V. Affannato. Bronte: Tip. Sociale, 1936. 14 pp.

Buonocore, D.—La Disinvoltura dell'Alighieri. Ischia: La Cultura, 1935.

Cambon, N. D.—Manzoni mistico. Milano: Bolaffio, 1935.

Carelli, L.—Roma e l'Impero nella nostra poesia. Napoli: "Siem," Stab. ind. ed. Meridionali, 1936. 24 pp. L. 2.

Cerveri de Girona.—Il Canzoniere inedito di —. Ed. F. A. Ugolini. Roma: G. Bardi, 1936. 170 pp.

Chimenz, S. A.—La poesia politica di G. Pascoli. Roma: "Ausonia," 74 pp. L. 6.

Coppola, G.—Cimosa carducciana. Bologna: Zanichelli, 1935.

Cosmo, U.—L'ultima ascesa. Introduzione alla lettura del Paradiso. Bari: G. Laterza e figli, 1936. 428 pp. L. 25.

Crocioni, G.—La poesia dialettale Marchigiana II. I poeti dei secoli XIX e XX. Fabriano: Tip. "Gentile," 1936. vii + 179 pp. L. 10.

Culcasi, C.—Pietro Metastasio. Torino: Paravia, 1935.

Dell'Isola, M.—Carducci nelle letterature d'Europa. Bologna: Istituto per l'istoria dell'Università, 1935.

Fineo, S.—Studi critici. Gravina di Puglia: "Sorrisi d'arte" (Catania: Tip. Sorace e Siracusa), 1936. 71 pp. L. 6.

Flora, F.—Il codice Baruffaldi della

Gerusalemme e dell'Aminta di Torquato Tasso *Milano*: Hoepli, 1936 53 pp L. 20.

Gaggia, M.—Documenti inediti su Panfilo Castaldi *Feltre*: Tip. "Panfilo Castaldi," 1935 35 pp

Gandolfo, A.—La "Cavalleria rusticana" in tribunale. Con documenti inediti *Catania*: Studio editoriale moderno, 1936. 40 pp. L. 3.

Giuffré, L.—Il problema delle ombre e delle luci nella Divina Commedia. *Palermo*: Trimarchi, 1935 129 pp. L. 12.

Grelle, R.—Ancora degli elementi classici nell' "Orfeo" del Poliziano. *Napoli*: "Siem," 1936. 63 pp.

Grossi, T.—Cecco Angiolieri e i burleschi del 200 e del 300 *Torino*: Paravia, 1936 100 pp L. 5

Milli, Giannina.—Nuova raccolta di poesie improvvisate da — Ed F Brasile *Bagnacavallo*: Tip Zattoni, 1936 64 pp L. 5.

Montanari, F.—Introduzione alla critica letteraria *Roma*: Ed "Studium," 1936 143 pp. L. 4.

Niccolini, P.—Ariosto Dopo il IV centenario. *Roma*: Formiggini, 1936. 444 pp. L. 20

Parenti, M.—Bibliografia manzoniana, ed. G. Gentile I *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1936. xxviii + 213 pp. L. 50.

Parini, Giuseppe.—Le odi Ed A. Cerretti. *Palermo*: S Andò e figli, 1936. 128 pp. L. 3

Prenestini, V.—"Miramar" di G. Carducci. *Napoli*: Tip. A Constantinopoli, 1936 29 pp.

Rho, E.—La missione teatrale di C. Goldoni Storia del teatro Goldoniano. *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1936. viii + 181 pp L. 12

Romanelli, P. B.—Scipione Maffei. *Roma*: Museo, 1935. 60 pp. L. 5.

Secret, J. H.—The DXV Problem and the *Veltro*. *Reading, Eng.*: Bradley, 1937. 32 pp \$0.25.

Sbarra, A.—La poesia di Lorenzo il Magnifico. Ed E Cavallero. *Napoli*: Ed. dell'Aquila bianca, 1936. 89 pp. L. 6

Zambarelli, L.—Gli oppositori della fede di Dante. *Vigevano*: Tip. Derelitti, 1935. 32 pp.

Zitarosa, G. R.—Lodovico Ariosto *Napoli*: Istit. Meridionale di Cultura, 1935.

SPANISH

Balseiro, J.—El Quijote de la España contemporánea: M. de Unamuno. *Madrid*: Giménez, 1935

Bouvier, R.—L'Espagne de Quevedo. *Paris*: Droz, 1936.

Castillo and Sparkman.—Aventuras de Gil Blas. IV. *Boston*: Heath, 1937. 60 pp.

Chabás, J.—Hist de la lit esp *Barcelona*: Gili, 1936

Dietrich, A.—Phonizische Ortsnamen in Spanien *Leipzig*: Dt Moigenland. Gesellschaft, 1936 36 pp

Entrambasaguas, J. de.—Miguel de Molinos *Madrid*: Aguilar, 1936

Entwistle, W. J.—The Spanish Language. *London*: Faber and Faber, 1936

Gregersen, H.—Ibsen and Spain. Harvard diss. *Cambridge*: Harv U Press, 1936 xiv + 209 pp. (Harv Studies in Romance)

Henríquez Ureña, P.—La Cultura y las letras en Santo Domingo *Buenos Aires*: Universidad de B A, 1936 193 pp

Juhá Martínez.—Nuevas notas sobre el teatro en Valencia en el siglo XVII. *Madrid*: 1936. 16 pp

La Grone, G. G.—The Imitations of "Don Quixote" in the Sp drama Pa diss *Philadelphia*. 1937. viii + 145 pp (Romance L. and L, 27.)

McClelland, I. L.—The Origins of the Romantic Movement in Spain *Liverpool*: Inst of Hispanic Studies, 1937 xii + 402 pp 18 s

Moro, V.—L'opera poetica di Nicasio Cienfuegos Frammento di uno studio su la lirica spagnola del sec XIX. *Firenze*: Tip già Chiari succ C. Mori [1936]. 14 pp.

Sackheim, M.—Die Lebensphilosophie des Dichters D. J Ruiz de Alarcón y Mendoza. Berlin diss., 1936. 155 pp.

Sieberer, A.—Katalomen gegen Kastilien. *Vienna*: Saturnverlag, 1936 309 pp.

GENERAL

Axhausen, K.—Die Theorien über den Ursprung der provenzalischen Lyrik. Marburg diss., 1937. xii + 81 pp.

Bailey, C., Richter, E., Alonso, A., Lida, R.—El Impresionismo en el language. *Buenos Aires*: Universidad de B. A., 1936. 278 pp.

Guido de Columnis—Historia Destructionis Troiae, ed. N. E. Griffin. *Cambridge, Mass.*: Mediaeval Acad., 1936. xviii + 293 pp.

Hill, D. S.—The Libraries of Washington. *Chicago*: American Library Ass., 1937. 312 pp \$3.50.

Lansel, P.—The Raeto-Romans, trans. by M. E. Maxfield. *Chur*: Bischofberger, 1937. 32 pp.

Palfrey, T. R. and Coleman, H. E.—Guide to bibliographies of theses. *Chicago*: American Library Ass., 1937. 48 pp. \$1.00.

Trends of Scholarship in the *MLA*. *New York*: MLA, 1937. 58 pp.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LII

NOVEMBER, 1937

Number 7

"LETARGO"

(*Par.*, XXXIII, 94)

A SIGNAL case of where acceptance of a double meaning, or rather two phases of meaning, would help solve a long standing debate over a metaphor,¹ is found in the *hapax legomenon* "*letargo*" of *Par.*, XXXIII, 94.² And with this interpretation is bound up also, in transitional function, the word "*punto*" in the same verse, with its familiar pair of meanings: "geometrical point," and "moment" or "instant."

From the time of his first vision of the Divine "Point" surrounded by the nine revolving angelic circles, in *Par.*, XXVIII, 16 ff., Dante has been continuously and systematically developing this theme of God as the center from which radiates the infinite sphere of the spiritual universe, and to which look and strive in eager love the angels and the souls of the Elect; and has thus led up to the swiftly approaching climax of the poem and of his spiritual journey, when in a last supreme moment is vouchsafed to his own vision its perfect consummation. Before Dante's powers of vision have undergone the mysterious spiritualizing transformation of canto XXX, he has gazed upon that central Point with rapt intellectual interest, while Beatrice expounded to him the secrets of the

¹ Scarano, in his commentary, says that the *terzina* involved here is "l'ultimo e il peggior tormento de' chiosatori!"

² It is found also in No. III of the apocryphal *Sette Salmi penitenziali* (Oxford ed. of *Tutte le Opere*, v. 1, p. 646), apparently as an equivalent of the *Vulgate* "*cicatrices*"—if so, a "horrible example" of what rhyme will lead a poetaster to perpetrate. (5) "*Ahimè! che 'l nostro putrido letargo, Lo quale io già pensava esser sanato, Per mia mattezza rompe, e fassi largo*"; cf. *Ps.* XXXVII, 6: "*Putruerunt, et corruptae sunt cicatrices meae, a facie insipientiae meae.*"

angelic hierarchies, and the theory of creation,³ since that strengthening he has beheld, with loving ecstasy, all the glories of the two Hosts of Heaven, and is now striving upward with all his soul's yearning might, and with Divine aid, to identify his vision with the Source of that Divine Ray⁴ which is the beginning and the end of all things that central Divine Light which he apostrophizes, in xxxi, 28-30. "Oh Trinal Light that in single star Scintillating in their sight, so satisfies them! Look down here at our tempest!"⁵ The immediately following comparison and the fact that it is so closely connected in location, should be noted here; as it contains a feature of prime importance for our discussion:

If the Barbarians, coming from that region that every day is covered by Helice, rotating with her son of whom she is fond, seeing Rome and its lofty structures, were astounded, when Lateran surpassed mortal things. I, who to the divine from the human, to the eternal from time had come, and from Florence to a people just and sane, with what amazement must I have been filled!⁶

³ For the word "punto" itself, in this connection, see xxviii, 16, 25; 41; 95; 101; xxix, 9 (cf. 12), xxx, 11.

⁴ *Par*, xxx, 106; xxxi, 90 (cf. 72. "li eterni rai"); xxxiii, 53; 77; cf. xi, 19; xxvi, 33; *Conv.*, iii, xiv, 4 f, etc; *Epist.*, xiii, 64 (cf. 70, 72); also *Par*, x, 83; the verb "raggiare" in this specific sense: *Par*, vii, 74; xiii, 58, xviii, 17; xxv, 54; xxviii, 16; xxix, 29 (cf. also *Conv.*, iii, ii, 14; vii, 8); the cognate verb "raiare": *Par*, xxix, 136 (cf. xv, 56).

⁵ "Oh trina luce che 'n unica stella / scintillando a lor vista, sì gli appaga! / Guarda qua giuso alla nostra procella!" It is interesting to compare with this figure that with which he expresses his satisfaction at the explanation given by Beatrice for the inverted order of the nine angelic rings, one suspects that the visualization of this helped toward the choice of the particular simile chosen: he says that then, in his mind, "come stella in cielo il ver si vide." (xxviii, 87; in vs 19 ff., he had compared the Point to a star)

⁶ *Par*, xxxi, 31-40: "Se i barbari, venendo da tal plaga / che ciascun giorno d' Eliee si cuopra, / rotante col suo figlio ond' ella è vaga, / veg-gendo Roma e l'ardua sua opra, / stupefaciensi, quando Laterano / alle cose mortali andò di sopra, / io, che al divino dall'umano, / all'eterno dal tempo era venuto, / e di Fiorenza in popol giusto e sano, / di che stupor dovea esser compiuto!" It is hard, indeed impossible, to get the exact flavor of "stupefaciensi" and "stupor" in an English rendering: it is the same for both verb and noun, in the Italian; but the English noun "astoundment" is so rare as to be disconcerting, "stupor" suggests a pathological condition that is often unassociated with the participle "stupefied," and other pairs of "synonymous" English words have other disadvantages of various kinds.—Cf. also *Purg.*, xxvi, 67-9.

Note, in the first place, that in the two passages taken as a whole, there is a thought of the sea and its storms, and of a long and heroic pilgrimage, an epic quest; and, secondly, that as the goal comes in sight, like a home-haven to which Dante advances guided by the light of the Divine Star—leaving earthly lodestars, as the Barbarians turned their backs on the dreary Northland—the emotion stressed is, naturally enough, that of awed, yet exultant, amazement. Then, with this in mind, consider the expression that comes in canto XXXIII, vss. 94-6, where Dante, penetrating with his God-strengthened vision more and more into the central Divine Light in which All Things are unified in "un semplice lume,"⁷ says that he believes that he saw "the universal form of this knot,"⁸ because in saying this he feels that he enjoys "più di largo";⁸ and he goes on "One *punto* alone is to me greater *letargo* than twenty-five centuries to the enterprise that made Neptune wonder⁹ at the shadow of the Argo." What is the inference? First of all: with Neptune's wonderment at the shadow of the Argo overhead,¹⁰

⁷ This must be the meaning here, I feel—or at least that primarily intended Buti, at least, and our own Longfellow, I am glad to note, so interpreted it

⁸ In view of the coming figure, is it not probable that this "largo" has here a flavor of the sea of which the Poet must at least have been conscious? And, further, is not the exact meaning here, not "more amply," but rather "more of [a feeling of] spaciousness," of that sense of security that the open sea (*il largo*) affords?—something about the opposite of that sensation of being so enveloped in a doubt as to be ready to burst through its confinements, expressed in *Purg.*, xvi, 53 f " . . . io scoppio / dentro ad un dubbio, s' io non me ne spiego."

⁹ Dante always uses *ammirare* in the sense of "wonder," never "admire", with this instance here, cf especially its occurrence in that other passage near the beginning of the *Paradiso*, which also refers to the Argonautic expedition: *Par.*, II, 16-18 "Que' gloriosi che passarò a Colco / non s' ammiraron come voi farete, / quando Iason vider fatto bifolco"

¹⁰ "Alla più antica impresa dell'umanità che volgeva alla conquista d'un prezioso bene, per misteriose e intentate vie, è in certo modo posto accanto dal Poeta la propria impresa, simbolicamente volta ad un medesimo fine, la conquista del più prezioso dei beni, per vie non meno misteriose, con ardimento non minore E Nettuno, che attraverso gli immensi e oscuri gorgi oceanici ammira l'ombra d' Argo, è come lo stesso Poeta, che attraverso la infinità del mistero, ha intraveduto un'ombra di Dio" (Parodi, in *Bullettino d Soc dant. ital.*, N S, xxiii, p 67)—The motif of Neptune's astonishment occurs also in *Inf.*, xxviii, 83 f., and there again it is in connection with what several of the leading older commentators

in the immediate context, as a confirmation, the meaning of "letargo" which parallels "stupor" (xxxI, 40) seems strongly recommended—and many expositors of importance argue, on more general grounds, for that meaning—; and "punto" of the same verse (xxxIII, 94) would form, with *one* of its meanings, the transition from the "Point" of Light. But: in this *terzina* (94-6) the "punto" is clearly contrasted with the centuries that have elapsed since the Argo sailed on that first arduous, glorious, and successful quest; therefore its meaning, that is, at least *one* meaning, must be of time: "moment." Now consider, further, the following fact: while the Latin and Italian words for "lethargy" were regularly understood in the modern meaning,¹¹ and while this meaning, synonymous with "stupor," seems both indicated by our parallels and most desirable in the context, at the same time Dante and his authorities not only knew that "Lethe," the stream of forgetfulness, was a related word, but they understood that *lethargus* and its cognates involved forgetfulness as the predominant aspect of their signification. Not only is this the expressed opinion, for example, of Uguccione of Pisa, in his *Magnae Derivationes*,¹² which has been termed by Toynbee¹³ "Dante's Latin Dictionary"; but *lethargus* is used for this special sense by Boethius in his *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, to Dante so familiar, in a passage which seems to have "suggested . . . the scene of Dante's reproach by Beatrice from *Purg.*, xxx, 73 onwards,"¹⁴ and which St. Thomas annotated, with emphasis on that phase of meaning.¹⁵

considered to be a word referring to the Argo "non vide mai sì gran fallo Nettuno, / non da pirate, non da gente argolica."—The point of Neptune's wonder, by the way, in both passages, may be that *even* Neptune, a god, was astounded. much more, then, mortal men

¹¹ In Pliny's *Natural History*, for example

¹² Oxford Bodleian MS. Laud 626, s. v "Leo les . . ." " . . . Item a *leo* *hec lethos. this, palus infernalis, quia delet memoriam. Unde et interpretatur oblivio. . . . Unde letheus. a. um., infernalis . . . vel obliuiosus. a. um. Unde et hoc letargus gi, id est morbus oblivionem afferens et sopnium Unde in Boethius. Philosophia dicit: 'Letargum patitur, scilicet comunem morbum illusarum mentium' Unde letargicus. a. um., obliuiosus. qui letargum patitur. et hec letargia e., ipsa oblivionis infirmitas. scilicet oppressio cerebri, cum oblivione et sopno iugi" (sic).*

¹³ *Romania*, xxvi, 537 ff

¹⁴ Moore, *Studies in Dante*, I, p 286 f.

¹⁵ The quotation has already been given, in part, in the passage from Uguccione (f n. 12, *supra*), Moore's quotation, *loc cit*, stops just short

By some such complex of meanings and interlacing of concepts, as Dante's mind with lightning-like rapidity glimpsed the varying facets of his thought and his poetic diction—not because the things themselves were changed, so much as because, as he says of his own developing vision of the Divine Light, "by reason of the sight which was gaining strength in me as I looked, one single appearance, as I kept changing, was travailing within me"¹⁶—, the apparent obscurity of our *terzina*, and the deadlocked disharmony of commentators may perhaps be explained; and by an open-mindedness to such possibilities, here, and elsewhere in the works of the Divine Poet, it may be that we can make some headway towards a final solution of more than one, perhaps many, of the difficulties of interpretation hitherto considered practically hopeless—by all except intransigent polemicists for individual and one-sided explanations.

H. D. AUSTIN

University of Southern California

[Je relèverais un trait frappant de ce passage: Dante voit le point central de l'*Univers*: il y aura donc dans tout ce passage le mouvement anti-nomique du *tout* (ou de l'universel) convergeant vers le *un*, du groupement et de la dissolution: tout ce qui est désagréé dans la vie, là devient intégration: *omnia* deviennent *uni-versum*. Je marque par — ce qui se groupe, par — ce qui s'éparpille

of the word; it is in the *De Cons. Phil*, I, Pros. 1 (*init.*). Lady Philosophy has just put her hand to Boethius' breast, and says "Nihil periculi est; *letargum* patitur communem inlusarum mentium morbum" The immediately following words emphasize the point of forgetfulness. "Sui paulisper *oblitus* est. *Recordabitur* facile sui siquidem nos ante cognoverit." Thomas Aquinas' commentary insists on this meaning, to the point of prolixity: "nos contuleramus tibi arma talia, id est documenta, quae nisi prius abiecisses per *oblivionem*, ipsa tuerentur te invicta firmitate. . . De his et similibus preceptis philosophicis Boethius *oblitus* fuit propter dolorem. . . Nota quod *letargia* est infirmitas causata ex oppressione cerebri cum *oblivione* et iungitur continuo somno" (the wording is similar to that in Uguccione), "et sic *letargus* est morbus inducens *oblivionem* et somnum; inde *letargicus* est est homo qui patitur talem morbum; et dicitur a *letes* quod interpretatur *oblivio*, etiam *Letes* est fluvius infernalis. Boethius ergo patiebatur *letargum*, id est morbum *oblivionis*, quia si praecepta philosophiae in *memoria* habuisset nunquam de amissione rerum temporalium doluisset," etc, etc

¹⁶ *Par.*, XXXIII, 112-114.

v 86. Legato con amore in un volume
 Ciò che per l'universo si squaderna,
 Sostanza ed accidente, e lor costume,
 Quasi conflati insieme per tal modo,
 Che ciò che dico, è un semplice lume

Ce rythme se continue, selon moi, dans les vers suivants:

La forma universal di questo nodo
 Credo ch'io vidi, perchè più di largo,
 Dicendo questo, mi sento ch'io godo

Largo ne fait probablement pas allusion à la 'mer ouverte' (j'attendrais alors plutôt *al largo*, d'autant plus que la 'sécurité du large' me semble assez problématique!), mais M. Austin a bien senti la nuance de 'spaciousness,' qui reprend les allusions à l'Univers si *vaste* se concentrant en un *punto*. Dante veut dire que sa jouissance était *large* malgré la vision du 'nœud' concentré de l'univers, du 'point' où s'intègrent les pluralités de ce monde. Je crois reconnaître le même procédé dans l'opposition de *punto* et *maggior* du vers 94: un 'point' provoque une stupeur méditative plus 'grande' (au sens matériel, dimensionnel du mot) que vingt-cinq siècles. C'est de l'anéantissement des dimensions physiques de notre monde dans la *visio beatifica* que le poète parle et le temps est aussi anéanti: un moment (*punto*) devient plus important que vingt-cinq siècles. D'ailleurs, la vision du poète, comme elle anéantit le physique et rassemble des contraires dans une unité paradoxale, est aussi paradoxale dans l'union d'attitudes psychologiques contraires: sa contemplation impassible, 'immobile' (v 98), est en même temps passionnée (98 *di mirar faceasi accesa*). L'idée de la 'forgetfulness' ressort aussi des v 100 et suiv.:

Aquella luce cotal si diventa
 Che *volgersi da lei per altro aspetto*
 È *impossibil che mai si consenta*;
 Però che il ben, ch'è del voler obbietto,
 Tutto s'accoglie in lei, e *fuor di quella*
 È *difettivo* ciò che lì è perfetto.

Il y a ici encore un rythme binaire: 'se recueillir' dans le principe Un et oublier la dissipation de Toutes-les-choses-d'ici-bas. Le Dante a su rendre par le rythme des idées, par un dynamisme psychique l'intégration du monde multiple en un Dieu Un. C'est le mouvement binaire qui embrasse en lui (et explique) les glissements de sens (dans *punto* et *letargo*).

Une difficulté subsiste dans les vers interprétés par M. Austin: le manque de parallélisme grammatical: on s'attendrait à

un *punto* solo m'è *maggior letargo*
 che *venticinque secoli agli ammiratori dell'impresa* . . .

M. Austin dit que le verbe *ammirare* signifie 's'étonner,' non pas 'admirer': on pourra facilement rappeler le *mi mirari* du philosophe ancien, mais ne devait-on pas aussi englober *ammirare* dans les mots signifiant la *contemplation*, la *vision*, dominant ce passage? *ammirare* est, de par son étymologie et son sens, une sorte de *mirare*, de vue, et il aurait aussi un double sens 's'étonner' (comme le fait Neptune) + 'regarder, contempler' (comme Dante contemple sa propre création, v la belle explication de Parodi, citée par M Austin). Les doubles sens des mots sont un reflet des aspects changeants (v 112-4) de ce monde multiple ramené à l'unité par le poète.

LEO SPITZER]

THE PEOPLE IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY FRENCH TRAGEDY

Richelieu and Louis XIV established an order in which the people had no voice; accordingly, in the theater, public opinion, a counterpart to tyranny, was no more than a relic of another age that had become a cliché. Like obsolete tyranny, emancipation may tempt the skill of a du Ryer or a Corneille, but does not engage his convictions. Such, I believe, is the consensus of modern criticism.¹ With due regard to the history of popular assertiveness, the temper of the government, and the persuasion of the dramatists, I submit that the tragedy of the XVIIth century embodies a new notion of the people.

Its appraisal of the people's significance is not uniform with all authors, or consistent in every play. It contains, for example, "Il faut pour être aimé régner trop mollement,"² "pour quiconque arrive au (trône) l'opinion publique est toujours une preuve,"³ a speech praising Rome's sense of gratitude and deriding Roman popularity⁴ . . . with words and actions to justify all verdicts. Varied as they are, and confounding usurpers and tyrants with rightful kings, maxims and episodes invest the alien cliché with suggestions shocking to French audiences, which, says d'Aubignac,

¹ Cf. G Lanson, *Histoire de la Littérature Française*, 18th ed., Paris, Hachette, 1924, p 622; *RHL.*, xxi, 206, C. Dejob, *Études sur la Tragédie*, Paris, Colin, n d, 5-6.

² Rotrou, *Antigone* (1637), II, 4.

³ Quinault, *Le Feint Alcibiade* (1658), I, 2.

⁴ Corneille, *Horace* (1640), v, 3

"ne veulent point croire que les Roys puissent estre mechans, ni souffrir que leurs Sujets, quoy qu'en apparence maltraitez, touchent leurs Personnes sacrées, ny se rebellent contre leur Puissance."⁵

Popular clamors are not actually represented on the stage, and when voiced are not reported by a spokesman of the people. The absence of the people does not, however, annul its rôle, and can hardly be said, as Faguet has it, to have made the French historical drama inferior to its Greek models. *Athalie*, in which "cette absence du peuple est . . . bien sensible,"⁶ is not the repertory of the XVIIIth century; and in *Athalie* the inertness of the people helps Racine portray a fanatical Joad. But Faguet also remarked that the Greek people "s'agite autour du drame plutôt qu'il n'y agit."⁷ I propose to show that the people of French tragedy participates in the action—is reported as participating, which, for my purpose, is sufficient.

Greek drama had limited the scope of public opinion. A reprimand for *Œdipus*,⁸ a warning to Agamemnon⁹ reveal no serious intrusion; a show of bitterness toward Orestes is kept within bounds by an administrative routine,

. . . if one gently yield him to their stress . . .

Their storm might spend its force. When lulls the blast,
Lightly thou mightest win thy will of them.¹⁰

The Latin play *Octavia* marks a departure in political drama with an outbreak provoked by an emperor's private life. Wondering why he may not change wife as other men do, Nero learns that "the people's grief could scarce endure such marriage" on the part of one who, being the greatest, owes the highest example.¹¹ The revolt, however, is short-lived and futile.

⁵ *La Pratique du Théâtre* (1657), ed. Martino, Paris, Champion, 1927, 27-73.

⁶ E. Faguet, *Drame Ancien Drame Moderne*, Paris, Colin, 1933, 207.

⁷ *Id.*, 132-133.

⁸ *Œdipus the King*, Loeb Classical Library, New York, 1919, *Sophocles*, I, 49, 63.

⁹ Euripides, *Hecuba*, Loeb Classical Library, New York, 1916, *Euripides*, I, 315.

¹⁰ Euripides, *Orestes*, Loeb Cl. Lib., ed. cit., *Euripides*, II, 183.

¹¹ Loeb Cl. Lib.; New York, 1917, *Seneca's Tragedies*, II, 455.

The French Renaissance dramatized power as an enigma which baffles initiative; witness the discomfiture of the crowd whose enthusiasm is a maneuver of Satan.¹² Seventeenth-century tragedy professes a political faith based on reason and experience (Lanson). Seneca's "Regi tuenda maxime regum est salus"¹³ is its motto. But interpretations differ. If safeguarding kingship is a king's prerogative, popular respect, it is argued, measures the accomplishment, and subjects are not bound beyond their respect. The mystery of the throne has given place to a mystery of the state, that is, in de Retz's words, a silence "dans lequel on ensevelit, en obéissant presque toujours aveuglement aux Rois, le droit que l'on ne veut croire avoir de s'en dispenser que dans les occasions où il ne seroit pas même de leur service de leur plaire."¹⁴ When certain circumstances command disobedience, kings become "sujets aux lois des hommes" (Rotrou). History, as Colbert noted, tells of such circumstances,¹⁵ and dramatists, d'Aubignac protested, are too prone to display their erudition.¹⁶

Likewise, the wisdom of conciliating opinion has ample antiquity. The policy may be attributed to the kings of a Sparta "qui ne donne à ses rois qu'un pouvoir limité," to Greek kings "dont le peuple est le suprême arbitre."¹⁷ But no foreign passport is needed when domestic credentials are available. Henri IV relinquishing his religion and Louis XIII publishing accounts of his affairs and explanations of his acts¹⁸ have naturalized the allegiance "qui se conseruant sans la crainte des Loix, est le plus fort appuy de la grandeur des Rois."¹⁹ The procedure of Agésilas in outwitting a rival politician,

J'ai fait, à votre exemple, ici des créatures . . .

Comme ils étoient à vous, les peuples sont à moi.²⁰

¹² Des Masures, *David Triomphant* (ed. Société des Textes Français Modernes, Paris, Cornély, 1907), 130-132, 143-145. Cf. Faguet, *La Tragédie Française au XVI^e Siècle*, Paris, Fontemoing, 1912, 165.

¹³ *Cædipus*, ed. Belles Lettres, Paris, 1926, I 242

¹⁴ *Mémoires*, Amsterdam, Bernard, 1717, I, 321.

¹⁵ Cf. Lange, *La Bruyère*, Paris, Hachette, 1909, 225.

¹⁶ Cf. *Dissertations concernant le Poème Dramatique*, *Recueil Granet*, Paris, 1740, I, 147; II, 33

¹⁷ Corneille, *Agésilas* (1666), III, 2; II, 1.

¹⁸ Cf. J. Boulenger, *Le Grand Siècle*, Paris, Hachette, 1924, 42

¹⁹ Du Ryer, *Saul* (1639-40), I, 1 (ed. Lancaster)

²⁰ *Agésilas*, III, 1.

claims modern precedents. The tragedy does not fail, however, to support the contention of absolutism: if, on the one hand,

En dédisant son roy, quelque juste apparence
Que puisse prendre un peuple, il commet une offense,²¹

on the other hand,

Un Roi qui peut céder n'est point digne de l'être ²²

On the contrary, the dramatists may be said to protest too much. They denounce the people's inconstancy,

Sa voix tumultueuse assez souvent fait bruit:
Mais un moment l'élève, un moment le détruit, ²³

its buoyancy, "jamais

Un souverain n'agit au gré de ses sujets . . .
Et ces soins d'un pouvoir qu'il cherche à maintenir
Sont des crimes secrets qu'ils ont droit de punir" ²⁴

This condemnation of the people would be out of proportion if the fact that it usually comes from a lawful monarch did not attest the enormity of the menace. But the offense is palliated, and resentment made ineffectual, by the monarch's shortcomings. A king does not qualify as a champion of royalty by evading a pledge.²⁵ If the expostulation "Est-ce de mes sujets que je dois prendre avis?" is true to Bossuet's doctrine, Orode's predicament undermines the protest.²⁶ Another rebukes his people's judgment, then demonstrates his own by a blunder.²⁷

²¹ Théophile, *Pyrame et Thisbé* (1621), III, 1. Cf. Lancaster, *History of French Dramatic Literature, in the Seventeenth Century*, Part II, Baltimore, 1932, II, 703.

²² Th. Corneille, *Persée et Démétrius* (1662), II, 1.

²³ Corneille, *Horace*, v, 3.

²⁴ Th. Corneille, *Maximian* (1662), III, 4. Cf. Tristan l'Hermite, *Mariane* (1636), IV, 1; Du Ryer, *Alcione* (1637), IV, 4; Corneille, *Héraclius* (1646-47), I, 1.

²⁵ *Alcione*, II, 3. Statesmen of the Fronde period argued that "la foy n'étoit que pour les Marchands" (de Retz, *op. cit.*, I, 165). In the drama (Hardy, *Mort d'Achille*, 1605-15; du Ryer, *Oléomédon*, 1634; *Scévole*, 1647) bad faith is the trait of a weak character. Similarly, the pronouncements "Apprenez que . . . rien (aux) sujets n'acquiert l'indépendance" (*Agésilas*, v, 7), "La raison défaillant, la violence est bonne A qui sçait bien user des droits d'une couronne" (*Pyrame et Thisbé*, I, 3) come, the one from the *Agésilas* mentioned above, the other from a king engaged in felony

²⁶ Corneille, *Suréna* (1674), III, 2; cf. III, 1.

²⁷ Th. Corneille, *Maximian*.

But opinion is not merely interested in exposing a sovereign's deficiencies. It seeks to insure the safety of the throne and thus to protect the ruler himself. In advocating a leadership "par où se maintient le respect des couronnes,"²⁸ it recalls to the king "qui veut de son Empire enseuelir l'honneur,"²⁹ the lesson of kings "qui s'estans mal conduicts . . . ont esté degradez."³⁰ Rarely free from excesses, opinion is generally based upon knowledge and its fringes of radicalism do not mask the validity of its remonstrances. The charge of instability which Corneille, for example, brought up, Corneille himself refuted by showing that the people "sunt toujours son but jusqu'à ce qu'il l'emporte."³¹ In matters requiring discrimination the people is not to be outdone; indeed, its insight suggests that Heaven inspires its voice and "fait que ce qu'elle a dit se trouve véritable."³²

Its respect for hereditary sovereignty does not exclude opposition to an incompetent sovereign and the demand that he be replaced, regardless of title, by an able leader. Certain forms are observed. It is agreed that retribution, soon or late, will overtake the usurper, although monarchs incapacitated by age, character, or sex are not superseded without the coöperation of the people.³³ Nor am I neglecting the possibility that state interest may move the people to displace an appointed usurper in favor of a prince who is legitimate and suitable.³⁴

Rebellion is not the only token of the people's power. There is the apprehension that stirs the monarch reflecting on a subject's popularity,

Ils vous ont jusqu'ici suivi comme fidèle;
Et quand vous le voudrez, ils vous suivront rebelle³⁵

²⁸ Rotrou, *Iphigénie* (1640), III, 5.

²⁹ Hardy, *Panthée*, I, l. 84.

³⁰ Tristan l'Hermite, *Osman* (1647), IV, 1. Cf. Boyer, *Artaxerce* (pub. 1683), IV, 1; Du Ryer, *Dynamus*, TC (1649-50), II, 2

³¹ Corneille, *Nicomède* (1651), V, 4.

³² Brueys, *Gabinie*, I, 3.

³³ Cf. Th. Corneille, *Bérénice* (1657), III, 2; Montfleury, *Trasibule* (1663), I, 3 and II, 2. The people is usually represented as opposed to the government of a queen, cf. Corneille, *Rodogune* (1645), I, 1; V, 1; *Nicomède*, III, 2; Th. Corneille, *Oamma* (1661), I, 1, *Laodice* (1668); *Théodat* (1672).

³⁴ Th. Corneille, *Bérénice*, V, 6.

³⁵ *Suréna*, III, 2; cf. *Théodat*, IV, 2.

There is the influence of the distressed subjects "qui font parler une douleur muette."³⁶ And there is the opinion that is surmised rather than stated; the testimony, for instance, which Suréna evokes in his quarrel with Orode, "le peuple s'attend à me voir arrêter."³⁷

If domestic intrigues and foreign alliances are matters of interest to the people, its particular concern is with the fate of the warrior whose renown makes him a victim of political discipline. The abused hero is found throughout the repertory under the names of Alcionée, Bellérophon (Quinault), Théodat, Suréna. . . . He is an idealist who courts exclusively "la gloire et le bruit d'une immuable foi," and, in his chosen field, claims for the warrior a rank second to none.³⁸ The people is quick to second the claim and eager to turn it to practical ends. Lanson overlooked the popular bent when he represented Corneille's Nicomède alone against his enemies.³⁹ The support of the people is emphasized by friend and foe: "Le peuple ici vous aime . . . et c'est être bien fort que régner sur tant d'âmes" (I, 1); "Il est le dieu du peuple" (II, 1; cf. I, 5); "Tout le peuple à grands cris demande Nicomède" (V, 4); and Nicomède himself knows wherein lies the defeat of his opponents,

. . . vos peuples alors, ayant besoin d'un roi,
Voudront choisir peut-être entre ce prince et moi (IV, 3).

Nor is it without significance that the tour de force of the perfect Cornelian hero is his refusal of the triumph which the people would thrust upon him.⁴⁰

The people's enthusiasm in rewarding valor is equalled by its instinct in rooting out mischief. The victims of its wrath often are some Métrobate or Zénon (*Nicomède*), the tools of mischief;

³⁶ *Artaxerce*, IV, 1.

³⁷ *Suréna*, IV, 4. Cf. Montchrestien, *Reine d'Escoce* (pub. 1604), II; *Nicomède*, III, 2; "(Le peuple) voit la servitude où le roi s'est soumis": Quinault, *Agrippa* (1662), I, 4; Th. Corneille, *Le Comte d'Essex* (1678), III, 1.

³⁸ Rotrou, *Bélisaire* (1643), V, 5. Cf. *Alcionée*, ed. Lancaster, Baltimore, 1930, 17; my article, *MLN*, LII, 1, 45, 51.

³⁹ Cf. *Esquisse d'une Histoire de la Tragédie Française*, Paris, Champion, 1927, 86.

⁴⁰ Cf. Th. Corneille, *Darius* (1658-9), IV, 7, v, 3; *Théodat*, IV, 4; v, 4.

but it strikes also promoters more or less accredited by the sovereign.⁴¹ In a few cases resentment attains the sovereign himself. Here again, with apologies to "un grand peuple irrité" (*Nicomède*), the dramatist furnishes safeguards. *Lèse-majesté* in the form of personal assault is avoided. It is difficult, even when (Th. Corneille's *Mort d'Annibal*) a king perishes in a clash, to say whether he was intentionally killed. Removal of the king (by suicide or murder at the hands of his wife)⁴² forestalls, intervention of the hero mollifies, the people. The quarrel may be brought to an end by the removal of the hero.⁴³ Conversion of the king affords the best solution of all, whether it is accredited to the sovereign's magnanimity or to the realization that the popular outcry is the voice of Heaven which "est toujours pour les Rois."⁴⁴

The palliatives do not conceal the intrusion of the people. In its off-stage position, with its views construed mostly by adversaries, the people is made manifest and—a novelty in its classical tradition—victorious. It does more than fight tyranny. It points beyond the interest of an individual monarch to the prestige of a throne as the true warrant of authority. The drama's awareness of the people is not altogether alien to the French order. The reason of the drama is not, however, the reason of Richelieu and Bossuet, who postulate the king's divine privilege of reason, nor does it treat kingship according to principles advocated by d'Aubignac and Colbert. Tragedy concedes the helpfulness of public opinion and demonstrates the quick consciousness and the indomitable vigilance of the people.

MAURICE BAUDIN

New York University

⁴¹ Cf. Corneille, *Pompée*; Th. Corneille, *Persée et Démétrius*.

⁴² Cf. *Camma*, v, 4; *Laodice*, v, 6.

⁴³ Cf. *Suréna*, *Persée et Démétrius*. See my article, *The Shifting of Responsibility in XVIIth-Century French Tragic Drama*, *MLN*, XLIX, 152.

⁴⁴ Th. Corneille, *Pyrrhus* (1663), v, 6; *Bérénice*, v, 10. P. Corneille gave an example of a conversion which is an undisguised submission to the people the successors of Attila propose to see "sous quelles lois tant de peuples voudront nous recevoir pour rois." (*Attila*, 1667, v, 7).

Cinque Cantz de Camilli. Le récit, qui n'est pas d'un intérêt extraordinaire, je le résume brièvement ici pour qui saura m'en indiquer la vraie source. La ville de Jérusalem vient de tomber aux mains des chrétiens et Godefroy est élu roi. Tancred, blessé, est soigné par la belle Hermine, dont Corbin nous retrace l'histoire telle qu'on la trouve dans la *Jérusalem délivrée*. Au cours d'un dialogue précieux et recherché, on apprend qu'Hermine aime éperdument Tancred, qui aime toujours Clorinde qu'il a tuée. Ensuite l'auteur reprend l'histoire d'Armide. Celle-ci s'est enfuie du champ de bataille. Après une longue course, sa monture meurt, la laissant désespérée, furieuse, au fond d'un vallon délicieux. L'arrivée d'un chevalier païen, Mulasse, l'empêche de se suicider. Elle demeure dans sa retraite, suivant de loin la brillante carrière de Regnaut, qu'elle aime et hait en même temps. Par un artifice, elle l'attire enfin et, sous un déguisement, se fait aimer de nouveau par lui. Mais il la quitte de nouveau, non sans renouveler la scène d'autrefois, pour suivre Tancred.

Celui-ci s'est mis à la recherche d'Hermine qu'on a enlevée du camp des croisés. Elle est tombée entre les mains d'un infidèle, le duc de Jaffes, dont elle s'éprend bien vite, oubliant son premier amour. Tancred, de son côté, l'aime à présent. Ici se place un épisode curieux. Un gentilhomme français, se rendant auprès de Godefroy, passe non loin de Jaffes et est fait prisonnier par le duc de cette ville. Il portait à Godefroy "certaines toiles où étoient peintes au vif & sur l'huile, toutes les histoires de la conquête Orientale." On donne ces toiles à Hermine, qui se les fait expliquer par le Français. Son fier discours excite la colère du duc. On fait brûler les toiles, et on est sur le point de faire brûler le Français (qui s'appelle Brulant) quand Filamante, telle Clorinde dans la *Gerusalemme*, lui sauve le vie.

Filamante n'était pas connue du Tasse. Cette guerrière, née en Egypte, est fille du comte d'Angliers et de sa femme Philistée, chrétiens et Français, que des pirates avaient emmenés au bord du Nil. Après la mort de ses parents, elle avait été adoptée par l'"empereur," qui l'avait élevée avec son fils Bélisard. Bélisard l'aime et se désespère de se croire son frère. A présent Bélisard est général d'une seconde armée que le Soudan son père a envoyée en Terre Sainte; Filamante est chargée aussi du commandement de troupes comme "colonelle."

Arrive de France un jeune guerrier, Bravemont, neveu de Regnaut, qui combat contre Filamante, brise son armet, s'éprend de sa grande beauté et se constitue son prisonnier. La guerrière lui déclare son amour, elle aussi, et le renvoie à l'armée chrétienne. Une grande bataille se prépare cependant. Harangues par les chefs des deux côtés. Armide se joint à l'armée de Bélisard, comme aussi le duc de Jaffes et Hermine. Dans la bataille, le duc est tué par Tancred, et Hermine s'enfuit sur la mer, où l'auteur la laisse. Armide, blessée, est convertie au christianisme par Regnaut, puis elle meurt. Bélisard se noie. Filamante et Bravemont sont blessés tous deux, mais guérissent et se marient. Et Corbin termine son roman sur la promesse de continuer l'histoire de ces belles amours si ce commencement se rend agréable aux oreilles délicates.

Goujet a cité une édition de ce roman pour l'année 1680; c'est une erreur, le volume de Corbin ne fut point réimprimé. Il existe cependant un autre roman dont il avait vu le titre, sans doute, et que je n'ai trouvé mentionné nulle part. C'est un roman de Sergé qui porte le même titre que celui de Corbin: *Jérusalem regnante, ou la Suite du Tasse. Traduction*. A Paris, Chez Jacques du Brueil, 1680. Le nom de l'auteur ne paraît pas sur le feuillet du titre, mais l'épître est signée: Sergé. Il est coté dans le catalogue de l'Arsenal, sans nom d'auteur, immédiatement après le roman de Corbin (8° B. L. 6995). L'histoire est exactement la même que dans l'autre livre, mais elle a été complètement refondue, raccourcie et écrite dans un style plus directe et alerte; c'est bien un autre ouvrage.

Ce roman, dont nous avons deux versions très distinctes, est bien une adaptation de la *Jérusalem délivrée* du Tasse, comme l'indiquent honnêtement les deux titres. Mais il apparaît que les deux auteurs français ont eu un modèle italien dans lequel l'adaptation se trouvait déjà faite, du moins en partie, car Sergé écrit dans sa préface: "Je peux nommer une suite du Tasse ce que le Tasse n'a point dit des amours d'Armide & d'Hermine. J'ay mis au bas, Traduction, sans nommer l'Authéur Italien que j'ay tourné; mais là-dessus j'ay suivi en partie Monsieur Corbin qui exposant il y a tres-long tems le meme Livre que moy aujourd'huy, cacha non seulement le nom de nôtre Authéur, mais cela aussi même que ce qu'il exposoit fût une Version. Ainsi l'Histoire de Bravemont & de Filamante, est un Roman Italien si le reste du Livre est Roman.

Je me suis un peu moins étendu que Monsieur Corbin, & je ne pense pas que j'en aye plus mal fait. Je puis toujours assurer que j'ay été pour le moins aussi fidèle que luy."

Quel est ce roman italien qui a été traduit deux fois en français ? Contient-il tout ce que donnent les deux romans français, ou seulement l'histoire de Bravemont et de Filamante ? Il m'a été impossible de trouver la réponse à ces questions. Je serai reconnaissant—et les historiens du roman français aussi, sans doute—à celui qui y répondra.

CHANDLER B. BEALL

University of Oregon

D'OÙ SORT L'APRÈS-MIDI D'UN FAUNE DE MALLARMÉ ?

On a beaucoup parlé de Symbolisme récemment à propos de l'Exposition du Cinquantenaire à la Bibliothèque Nationale, et, par conséquent, de Mallarmé, leur représentant par excellence. Quatre éditions spéciales de son plus célèbre poème figurent dans la vitrine du maître ; et les discussions continuent sur l'origine de *L'Après-midi d'un Faune* (publié, 1876) (Martino, Henning, Raynaud, etc) : Ce serait Banville qui avait composé plus de dix ans avant un court poème sur le même sujet, *Drane au Bois* (1863), ou ce serait la visite à la National Gallery à Londres, aussi 9 à 10 ans avant, qui aurait été ou n'aurait pas été le point de départ . . . N'est-il pas beaucoup plus simple de voir dans le poème de Mallarmé tout bonnement une expression de l'hellénisme de l'époque, du "ménardisme" auquel tout adorateur de la muse sacrifiait à cette époque : Gautier, l'auteur des *Affinités secrètes*, Banville, l'auteur des *Dieux en Exil*, Leconte de Lisle dans ses *Poèmes antiques*, Victor Hugo lui-même dans les *Chansons des Rues et des Bois*, et tant d'autres—sans compter la *Prrière sur l'Acropole* de Renan, en prose. Pourquoi parler spécialement de Banville ou de Boucher ?

Mais surtout comment se fait-il que les Mallarméens n'aient pas cherché chez le poète lui-même les circonstances de l'inspiration ? Le hasard nous a mis entre les mains une publication ignorée de la plupart des commentateurs et qui nous paraît contenir le secret,—s'il faut chercher un secret. Peu de temps avant l'apparition du

poème, Mallarmé avait été chargé par l'éditeur Rothschild de faire une adaptation française de la *Mythologie* de Cox, parue en Angleterre; Cette adaptation fort artistiquement faite, et illustrée d'une façon charmante, presque somptueuse, parut en 1880; elle est intitulée *Les Dieux antiques, Nouvelle Mythologie illustrée, d'après George W. Cox, et les Travaux de la science moderne . . . ouvrage orné de 260 vignettes reproduisant des statues, bas-reliefs, médailles, camées*—Paris, Rothschild éditeur, 1880. Cherchez sous Faunes ou Pan, vous trouverez un Mallarmé tout plongé dans l'atmosphère nécessaire à l'inspiration de *L'Après-midi d'un Faune*.

Il y a mieux. A la fin du volume, Mallarmé a imprimé un certain nombre de poèmes français contemporains, un de Victor Hugo (*Le Satire*), plusieurs de Banville, et enfin un de Leconte de Lisle qui contient absolument tous les éléments de *L'Après-midi d'un Faune*. Le poème n'est pas bien long, et le plus simple est de le reproduire. Quiconque a seulement un vague souvenir du texte de Mallarmé y trouvera une "source" bien plus naturelle que celles qu'on a voulu indiquer—si, répétons-le, il est nécessaire de chercher une source.

PAN

Pan d'Arcadie, aux pieds de chèvre, au front armé
De deux cornes, bruyant, et des pasteurs aimé,
Emplit les verts roseaux d'une amoureuse haleine
Dès que l'aube a doré la montagne et la plaine,
Vagabond, il se plaît aux jeux, aux chœurs dansants
Des Nymphes, sur la mousse et les gazons naissants
La peau du lynx revêt son dos; sa tête est ceinte
De l'agreste safran, de la molle hyacinthe,
Et d'un rire sonore il éveille les bois
Les Nymphes aux pieds nus accourent à sa voix,
Et légères, auprès des fontaines limpides,
Elles entourent Pan de leurs rondes rapides.
Dans les grottes de pampre, au creux des antres frais,
Le long des cours d'eau vive échappés des forêts
Sous le dôme touffu des épaisses yeuses,
Le Dieu fuit de midi les ardeurs radieuses;
Il s'endort; et les bois, respectant son sommeil,
Gardent le divin Pan des flèches du Soleil.
Mais sitôt que la Nuit, calme et ceinte d'étoiles,
Déploie aux cieux muets les longs plis de ses voiles,
Pan, d'amour enflammé, dans les bois familiers
Poursuit la vierge errante à l'ombre des halliers,
La saisit au passage; et, transporté de joie,
Aux clartés de la lune, il emporte sa proie.

(*Poèmes antiques*).

De Mallarmé, par Mallarmé, l'hellénisme s'est attardé encore quelque temps chez les Symbolistes—tel Henri de Régnier, dans ses *Poèmes anciens et romanesques* (1890), voir par exemple, *Le fol Automne*, et d'ailleurs chez Moréas.

ALBERT SCHINZ

University of Pennsylvania

CHAUCER'S *BOOK OF THE DUCHESS* AND TWO OF GRANSON'S *COMPLAINTEs*

Although Chaucer's indebtedness to such mediæval writers as Froissart, Deschamps, and Machaut has been frequently discussed, his literary relationship with another French contemporary, Sir Oton de Granson, has been neither often investigated nor fully appraised. This is the more surprising in view of the fact that Chaucer in his *Complaint of Venus* is known to have translated three of Oton's ballades. The French originals of this *Complaint* were first discovered in 1890 by Dr. Arthur Piaget, and the basis for all subsequent discussions of Chaucer and Sir Oton's literary connections has remained these two articles by Piaget.¹

The publication in 1904 of Dr. G. L. Schirer's dissertation, *Oton de Granson und seine Dichtungen*, though it has received little notice, is of the deepest interest to Chaucerian students, since this dissertation not only affords supplementary bibliographical data for the study of Granson but also supplies an edition of all his poems then known to exist.²

Among the contemporary poets of France, the only one whom Chaucer mentions by name is Oton de Granson, whom in the envoy of the *Venus* he calls the "flour of hem that make in Fraunce" (v. 82).³ This is sufficient evidence of the high esteem in which Chaucer held Sir Oton's verses, and there is also ample reason for supposing that they were good friends. Unfortunately not all the

¹ "Oton de Granson et ses poésies," *Romania*, xix (1890), 237-59; 403-48.

² Georg Ludwig Schirer, *Oton de Granson und seine Dichtungen*, Strassburg, 1904.

³ *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. by F. N. Robinson, New York, 1933, p. 633 f.

poems thought to have been written by Sir Oton have as yet been recovered. And thus it is quite possible that some of these may also have exerted an influence on Chaucer.

In working recently on this problem, I have discovered the existence of several of Granson's poems in rare manuscripts so far unprinted. As my investigations are, however, still in an initial stage, I shall not now attempt to discuss the matter at length, but shall reserve a more complete statement for a later occasion when I may expect to have all the available evidence readily at hand. Meanwhile, Schirer's edition provides more complete data than hitherto noted for comparing Chaucer and Granson's works, and suggests, indeed, a number of new leads for exploration. Of these I wish at present to discuss only one, which seems to reveal a new instance of Sir Oton's influence on Chaucer.

For the *Book of the Duchess* French sources have long been established for several passages, but no actual parallel has ever been presented for the general plan of the poem. Machaut's *Le Roy de Behaingne*, which Professor Kittredge⁴ has briefly summarized, Chaucer unquestionably made use of for certain details. But it is quite as certain, on the other hand, that he could not have here found any strong hint for his central situation.

The chief dissimilarity, it should be observed, is that the French version is a typical love *débat*, whereas the English account concerns only the complaint of a lover comforted by a sympathetic listener. Instead of dealing with a knight and a lady, Chaucer moreover breaks the conventional scheme by describing specifically a knight and a poet. The French *débat* between a hero and heroine ends in a reconciliation. The English poem deals pointedly with a knight's complaining the decease of his mistress and with the poet's attempt to comfort him. Machaut's plot hinges on the solution of the lover's dilemma, whereas Chaucer has naught to say about an "amourette," nor the unriddling of the oft-repeated "*querelle des amants*."⁵

In fact, it should be noted that *Le Songe Vert* more closely approximates the Chaucerian version, since it is a man (the author)

⁴ "Chauceriana," *MP*, VII (1910), 465 ff.; see also "Guillaume de Machaut and *The Book of the Duchess*," *PMLA*, xxx (1915), 1 ff.

⁵ Professor Lowes (*Geoffrey Chaucer*, New York, 1934, p. 126) seems to go too far in stating that Chaucer "catches the suggestion for his central situation" from Machaut.

who here mourns his lately deceased mistress.⁶ In this connection, still another French poem, Jehan da la Mote's *Le Regret*, should be briefly alluded to. In this dream-vision, the author lay on his bed "endormant melancolie" and dreamed that he was in a "haute foriest plaisant." Later on, the dreamer gains access to a castle where thirty damsels mourn the loss of their "cher sire," and in eulogizing the departed, each maiden ends her complaint with a ballade.⁷

But here as before it seems important to note the lack of comparison with Chaucer, since neither *Le Songe Vert* nor *Le Regret* describes a poet whose main purpose it is to comfort a bereaved knight. These two French dream-visions also lack the fundamentally striking feature of a knight who makes a formal complaint to himself. On analysis it thus appears that in the *Book of the Duchess* the central situation is distinct, and that these proposed models, like the others, accordingly do not suffice to explain the Chaucerian divergencies from the conventional pattern. Indeed, one should be inclined to regard the new and individual features in the English poem as Chaucer's own invention were it not that these very details unaccounted for in the supposed originals occur in two complaints by Granson, Chaucer's avowed favorite among French poets.

In *La Complainte de l'an nouvel*,⁸ for example, a poet vexed by melancholy goes out on New Year's Eve into the woods, where he overhears a knight complaining sadly of the pangs of unrequited love. In "sa complainte," the *chevalier* recounts in detail the constancy of his service and the unkindness of his mistress. The verses conclude with the poet's coming forward to comfort the *chevalier* and to learn more about the cause of his distress.⁹

Although the substance of the French and English poems is different, it should be observed that the first and last verses in particular of *La Complainte* bear importantly on Chaucer's central situation. The significant features in common seem to be as follows:

⁶ See further Professor Sypherd, "Le Songe Vert and Chaucer's Dream-Poems," *MLN*, xxiv (1909), 46 f.

⁷ See further Miss Rosenthal, "A Possible Source of Chaucer's *Booke of the Duchesse* . . .," *MLN*, xlviii (1933), 511-14

⁸ The full title is *La Complainte de l'an nouvel que Gransson fist pour un chevalier qu'il escoutoit complaindre*.

⁹ No. 11 in Schirer's edition, pp. 36 ff.

1. The setting is the same—the scene is laid in a wood; the time is toward morning.
2. The poet, in both accounts, is described as moody and longing for diversion.
3. The principal characters are the same; namely, a poet and a knight.
4. Chaucer's knight, like Granson's *chevalier*, makes a "compleynte to hymselfe"
5. Finally, the poet, in each version, wishes to comfort the knight, and comes "avant pour le reconforter" or to "amende" his sorrows.

On the other hand, it may be objected that the *chevalier*, unlike the black knight, does not beweepe the decease of his lady. But for this and other arresting points, one need only turn to Granson's *Complainte de saint Valentin*. In the middle of this French poem, there appears a poor lover lamenting the death of his mistress:

Je voy chanter, rire, dancer,
Mais je me voy seul en tristesse,
Pource que j'ay perdu mon per,
Non pas per, mais dame et maistresse¹⁰

Thus, like the black knight in the *Book of the Duchess*, Granson's mourning *chevalier* is inconsolable.¹¹ He thinks that death is the only solution, which calls to mind the statement in Chaucer: "Allas, deth, what ayleth the, / That thou noldest have taken me, / Whan thou toke my lady swete" (vv. 481-83). The *chevalier* feels, moreover, that he shall never love another. At this juncture, the God of Love and Saint Valentin appear before him. Finally after his many protestations of disinterest, these high personages persuade him to see a new *amie*. And, as the verses conclude, the knight appears to have found a new mistress, although he still avows he can not forget "celle dont j'ay plant / Si longuement la departie."

In view of the foregoing evidence, these two French texts ap-

¹⁰No. 37 in Schirer's edition, pp. 100 ff. This poem is also printed under a different title, "Autre Complainte de nouvelle accountance," in A. Duchesne's edition of Alain Chartier's *Œuvres*, Paris, 1617, pp. 759-66.

¹¹As noted by Mr. W. A. Neilson, Granson "dwells on the lover's melancholy (Nos. 17, 20, 31) [Piaget, *Rom.*, xix, 420, 424, 433-34] and on his tendency to dream of his lady, and to brood upon her memory at all times (Nos. 12, 23, 31) [*Ibid.*, pp. 419, 429, 435]" See "Orig. and Sources of the Court of Love," *Harvard Studies and Notes in Phil and Lit.*, Boston, 1899, vi, 75.

pear to have had a direct influence on the *Book of the Duchess*. The acceptance of this conclusion does not imply that Chaucer in several passages of his narrative was not also drawing upon other French sources. The two complaints of Granson are of course only further illustrations of a literary genre in the fourteenth century quite *à la mode*. But the highly significant fact is that Chaucer and Granson depart from the conventional models at almost precisely the same points. The absence of these special deviations in the other French poems and their appearance in the two complaints would thus appear to show that for the central situation Granson was Chaucer's more immediate source. In the *Book of the Duchess*, it would appear, therefore, that in some passages Chaucer was imitating Machaut, whereas in others he was unquestionably following Granson.

HALDEEN BRADDY

New York University

ROGER DE WARE, COOK

Henry Bailly, hosteler, responsible citizen, and representative of Southwark in Parliament,¹ may well have been pleased with the courtly Chaucer's portrait of him in the hearty and effective leader of the Canterbury pilgrims. But may not that shadowy Londoner,² Roger of Ware, cook, have had some cause to complain at the figure he cut in the pilgrimage? At the allusions in the Host's "sooth pley" to his fly-specked shop and warmed-over pies? At fathering on him the fragmentary story of the flowering of that gambling, wenching, thieving rogue, Perkyn Revelour? At the sorry picture in "The Manciple's Prologue" of the "stynkyng swyn," ape-drunk and thirsty still? At the bad horsemanship? the gaping mouth? the ill-fame, the foul breath?

What kind of man, to suffer this abuse, could the real Roger of

¹ For the records of Henry Bailly see J. M. Manly, *Some New Light on Chaucer*, New York, 1926, pp. 77-83.

² Chaucer's pilgrim bears the name of a cook of London who has got into the records, e. g., in a list of attorneys in a plea for debt (1377) Roger Ware of London, Cook. The records so far noticed reveal nothing certain of the man except his name. Cf. Miss Edith Rickert in *The London Times Literary Supplement*, 1932, p. 761.

Ware have been? Next best to a personal interview, one might think, would be the report of half-dozen of his cronies. The sworn testimony of a dozen of his neighbors³ would be too much to ask; yet that, by a long series of coincidences, is what we have preserved in the *Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls . . . of the City of London, 1364-1381*.

Ward Presentments, by the oaths of the twelve jurors

Langebourn Roger de Ware, cook, who was presented as a common nightwalker, confessed his offence and put himself on the mercy of the Court.⁴

Roger's twelve neighbors knew what they meant when they said 'common nightwalker.' It behoved them, moreover, as a jury of presentment, to be precise. A nightwalker, by simplest definition, was one guilty of wandering about the streets after curfew, contrary to numerous ordinances, whose frequent proclamation suggests their frequent violation. The following, selected, presumably as representative, by the compiler of the *Liber Albus*, is typical:

Of keeping the peace.

For keeping and maintaining the peace of his lordship the King in the City of London and in the suburbs thereof, it is ordained by his lordship the King and his Council, with the assent of the Mayor, Aldermen, and Commonalty of the said City of London, in manner following;—that no one be so daring as to go wandering about within the said city, or in the suburbs, after the hour of curfew rung out at the church of Our Lady at Bow, unless he be a man known to be of good repute, or his servant, for some good cause, and that with a light, the which curfew shall be rung at the said church between the day and the night. And if any one shall be found wandering about, contrary to this Ordinance, he is to be forthwith taken and sent unto the prison of Newgate, there to remain until he shall have paid a fine unto the City for such contempt, and have found good surety for his good behaviour.⁵

But the cook was not merely picked up once after curfew. He was, by reputation and his own admission, a common nightwalker. We can get a better idea of both the denotation and connotation of this term by viewing it in its common context. The *Inquests as to evildoers and disturbers of the King's peace taken before the*

³ Frederick Pollock and Frederic W. Maitland, *The History of English Law*, Second Edition, Cambridge, 1923. See *presentment* in Index.

⁴ A. H. Thomas, ed., *Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls, 1364-1381*, Cambridge, 1929, p. 156.

⁵ *Liber Albus* (tr. by Henry Thomas Riley), London, 1861, p. 334.

Mayor and Sheriffs in the presence of John de Shirbourne, Coroner, July 5, 1340, are revealing:

The jury drawn from the Wards of Broad Street, Walbrook, Dowgate and Candlewick Street [for example] present Thomas Whiteheved, Joan la Tapstere and William atte Ponde as persons of ill-fame, and say that a house in Apcherche Lane—"atte Pye on the hope"—and a brewhouse near the Church of St. Mary Wolnoth are the resort of bad characters; they further say that John le Parker is a receiver of evildoers and women of ill-fame, that John Albion and Master John le Lech are thieves . . . ; that Sarra le Mareschal, dwelling in the Rents of the Archdeacon of Colchester, keeps a disorderly house; . . . that Walter Walteshelf, Gracian le Palmer and John Walssh are nightwalkers, well dressed and lavish of their money, though no one knows how they get their living, and that these people, if they had their opportunity, would sooner consort with bad characters and disturbers of the peace than with men of good report.⁶

Here no punishments are mentioned, but we know from ordinances and the records of trials that a 'common nightwalker' involved in false dicing, wenching, fighting, or the unlawful frequenting of taverns could expect to be "lad with revel to Newegate" or the Tun; in some cases, again "with trumpets and pipes," to the pillory.⁸

Though our jury described the cook more than a decade before Chaucer did,⁹ the best picture of the daily interests and occasional

⁶ A. H. Thomas, ed., *Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls, 1323-1364*, Cambridge, 1926, pp. 125-6.

⁷ Henry Thomas Riley, ed. and tr., *Memorials of London and London Life*, London, 1868, p. 459.

⁸ Cf. e. g. *Liber Albus*, pp. 395-6, and *Memorials of London and London Life*, pp. 86-9.

⁹ Roger need not, however, have had wide and enduring reputation as a 'roarer.' Chaucer's Cook (and others among the pilgrims, too?) may have derived from merely private reminiscence. One sometimes uses in anecdote the real name of a man unknown to one's audience. The entries on either side of the presentment are dated May, 1373. In May, 1374, Chaucer obtained his house above nearby Aldgate and shortly thereafter his office in the Custom House. His path between office and home may have crossed the eastern tip of Langbourn. (See Langbourn in Henry A. Harben: *A Dictionary of London*, London, 1918; also maps in Gordon Home. *Mediaeval London*, London, 1927, and in G. E. Mitton *Maps of Old London*, London, 1908.) On the other hand, the cook need not have been a resident of the ward that presented him. Henry Bailly's familiarity with the shop and his "Of many a pilgrym hastow Cristes curs" suggest Southwark rather. And nightwalkers were sometimes presented in more than one ward.

punishments of such a rogue as Roger must have been is the fragmentary story which Chaucer ascribes to Hodge in *The Canterbury Tales*. The story is appropriate to Chaucer's Cook; to the cook of the presentment it is singularly so. Roger de Ware, it would seem, was in no position to object to Chaucer's ugly picture of him. To the poet, as to his neighbors, he could only have "confessed his offence and put himself on the mercy of the Court."

EARL D. LYON

University of California

TWO CHAP-BOOK VERSIONS OF "THE SEVEN SAGES OF ROME"

In the introduction to his edition of the Cotton MS of the *Seven Sages of Rome* (Boston, 1907), Prof. Killis Campbell describes no fewer than twenty-six modern English prose versions, most of them dating from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. These versions, he points out, derive not from the Middle English manuscript sources but from the prose text first printed by Wynkyn de Worde (?1515), which in turn was translated from some member of the Latin *Historia* family.¹ Two versions not included in Campbell's list deserve perhaps brief description.²

I

The first is a chap-book described on the title-page as "the three and twentieth edition" and is especially interesting in that it contains besides the usual fifteen stories four additional tales. The title-page reads:

The / HISTORY / of the / *Seven Wise* MASTERS / of / ROME: / containing / *Seven Days* Entertainment. / In many Pleasant and Witty *Tales* or *Stories*. / Wherein / The Treachery of Evil Counsellors is discovered; / Innocency cleared; And, The Wisdom of *Seven / Wise* PHILOSOPHERS displayed. / *Newly Corrected, and better Explained and Enlarged* / Adorned with many Pretty PICTURES / lively Expressing the HISTORY. / *The Three and Twentieth EDITION*. / Printed by A. W. for G Conyers, at the

¹ Campbell, pp. lx-lxvi.

² These are in the possession of Prof. Archer Taylor, who has kindly allowed me to make use of them.

Ring, in / *Little-Britain*, Pr. 1 s. Where are Sold, / *The History of the Seven Wise Mistresses*, Pr. 1 s / *The History of Gesta Romanorum*, Pr. 1 s. / As also, *A Dialogue betwixt Riches & Poverty*, 6 d / All Adorned with CUTS. A-F^a.³

The "Preface to the Reader" (Sig. A3-A5^v) contains a justification of the framework story as "moral allegory." The Emperor here signifies the world, and his only son stands for all mankind. When man's true mother (Reason or Divine Grace) dies, man falls into the hands of a step-mother (Sin), an Empress of great cunning. She "studies by all possible Means the Confusion of Man, and would prevail with his Weakness, but that a Star from Heaven (by which is meant Goodness from above), instructs Man how to avoid the Allurements of Sin, by not opening his Mouth to bid her Welcome." The Seven Wise Masters represent the seven liberal sciences, by whose aid man frustrates the intentions of sin and so gains a crown of eternal happiness, "prepared for all those that in this Life labour to attain to Heaven by doing well."⁴

The Preface includes also, "to give a relishing Taste of what is in the Book," a short tale of an old gentleman who was cuckolded by his young wife. The suspected wife, tied to a post in a pond by her jealous husband, contrives to be replaced by an old woman, who is then visited by the husband and whose nose he cuts off. After the wife resumes her place and the husband finds on a second visit that she is whole, he is seized with remorse and "looseth his most chaste Wife, and brings her again to his Bed. . . ."⁵

In the framework story the Emperor is named Pontianus, his son Dioclesian, and the seven masters Pontillas, Lentulus, Craton, Malquedrake, Josephus, Cleophes, and Solon. The order of stories is the usual one in the *Historia* versions.⁶

The most interesting feature of this chap-book is the inclusion of four additional tales (pp. 133-44), "to render this Book more Entertaining." These prove to be stories from *Erasto*, which in turn goes back to another group of the "Seven Sages" stories, the "Versio Italica."⁷

³ George Conyers specialized in books of popular interest, and books sold by him "at the Ring in Little-Britain" are listed in the *Term Catalogues* from 1686 to 1708. See H. Plomer, *Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers . . . from 1668 to 1725* (Oxford, 1922), p. 80.

⁴ Sig. A3^v-A4.

⁵ Sig. A5^v

⁶ See Campbell, p. xxxv.

⁷ Campbell (p. lxvi) notes that one of the later English chapbook ver-

The first of these is the story of Cleander of Padua, who killed his wife Sophia and his servant Henry merely on the malicious information of a maidservant whom the wife had earlier punished for immoral behavior. This is a condensation of the tale told by Enoscoipo in chapter XIV of *Erasto*.⁸

The second is the story of the young woman of Modena who murdered her aged husband in order to marry a young lover. The husband's faithful dog discovers the improvised grave outside the city, the townspeople become aware of what has happened, and the woman and her maid-accomplice are condemned to be burned alive. This forms chapter XVIII of *Erasto*, where it is related by Agatho.⁹

The third is the tale of the ungrateful and treacherous Philemon, nephew of Archelaus, prince of Aquitaine. After contriving a plot whereby Euphrosyna, wife of Archelaus, is suspected of treachery and put to death, he plots with the captain of the guard and murders Archelaus himself. Later, however, through the intervention of the King of France, Philemon is captured and both he and the captain are condemned to be burned at the stake. The story in *Erasto* (chapter XXI) is substantially the same, but related in much fuller detail.¹⁰

The fourth relates the story of the physician of Milan, who discovers too late that the juice of an onion which his dying son cried out for would have dissolved the "stone" at the bottom of his stomach. In *Erasto* (chapter XX) the physician is named (Policeto), as is also his wife (Flaminia).¹¹

sions (No. 11 in his list) inserts "near the end four stories that are not found elsewhere in the collection," but says nothing of their source in *Erasto*. For the "Versio Italica" see Campbell, pp. xxviii-ix. A translation of the Italian version by Francis Kirkman was published in 1874 under the title of *The History of Prince Erastus* (*Term Catalogues*, I, 169).

⁸ *I Compassionevoli Avvenimenti di Erasto . . .* (Vinegia, 1556), pp. 85-106. Cf. also the French translation, *Histoire Pitoyable du Prince Erastus, fils de Diocletien, Empereur de Rome* (Paris, 1570), pp. 107-33 (pages numbered on recto only); and Kirkman, pp. 103-29. The wife's name in these versions is Beatrice, Bietrix.

⁹ *I Compassionevoli Avvenimenti*, pp. 153-69; *Histoire Pitoyable*, pp. 193-213, Kirkman, pp. 188-206.

¹⁰ *I Compassionevoli Avvenimenti*, pp. 205-29; *Histoire Pitoyable*, pp. 256-86; Kirkman, pp. 277-302.

¹¹ *I Compassionevoli Avvenimenti*, pp. 192-205; *Histoire Pitoyable*, pp. 240-56; Kirkman, pp. 251-58.

II.

The title-page of the second book reads:

The / HISTORY / of the / SEVEN WISE MASTERS / of / ROME. / Containing / many ingenious and entertaining / STORIES, / wherein / the Treachery of Evil Counsellors / is discovered, Innocency cleared, / and the / Wisdom of the SEVEN WISE MASTERS / displayed. / Philadelphia: / Printed for the Booksellers. / 1798.¹²

The "preface to the Reader" likewise justifies the collection of stories on moral grounds. The explanation of the allegory is somewhat different: "the emperor signifies a natural man, the empress sin, the son conscience, and the wise masters such as give sacred council, and keep us from destruction. . ." ¹³

As in the first volume, the emperor is named Pontianus and the son Dioclesian. The seven masters are Pantillus, Lentullus, Cratoa, Malquidrake, Josephus, Cleophes, and Diocles—substantially identical with those in the other version, except for the name of the seventh master. The order of stories is that of the other volume, but all are drastically condensed. The volume is completed with extracts from Dodsley's *Economy of Human Life*.¹⁴

As an example of the extreme compression exercised in the narration, the twelfth story (*Amatores*) may be quoted:

Most noble emperor, said he, there lived in this city a knight who married a beautiful lady, whose voice was so charming, that when she sung, it ravished the hearers, notwithstanding their taste for music was but small.

It happened that as she was singing with her casement open, that three knights, whom the then reigning emperor had in great esteem, passed by, and being much taken with her voice and comeliness of her person, they took their convenient time severally without the knowledge of each other, to treat with her about enjoyment: to which she seemingly consented, in consideration that they brought an hundred florins each; appointing them

¹² Campbell's list of later prose versions includes only one (p lxxv) printed in the United States (Boston, 1794).

¹³ Sig. A2.

¹⁴ From the first section of Dodsley's book the following extracts are reprinted: Part I, sections i (Consideration), iii (Application), vii (Contentment); Part II, sections i (Hope and Fear), ii (Joy and Grief), iv (Pity), v (Desire and Love); Part IV, sections iii (Son), iv (Brothers); Part V, sections i (Wise and Ignorant), ii (Rich and Poor); Part VI, sections iii (Charity), iv (Gratitude), v (Sincerity). From section two come: Part II, section i (Vanity); Part III, sections i (Covetousness), ii (Profusion).

to come to see her at different times, and she would receive them. which done, she acquainted her husband advising him to stand with his sword drawn, and as they entered to kill them, which he performed So that after they had taken their money, they found means by the help of the lady's brother, to convey them to the sea that was nigh at hand, she insinuating that her husband unfortunately killed them in a quarrel, but not long after the knight and his lady falling at variance, and he striking her, she cried out aloud in the hearing of many, O cruel man, what, will you murder me, as you did the three knights of the emperor's court? Now the knights being missed, the words created a suspicion, insomuch that they being both seized, soon confessed the fact, whereupon they, together with her brother, were cruelly tortured to death.¹⁵

As thus related, the story is little more than a crude summary, occupying slightly more than a page, in the other version, which covers seven pages, the adventures of the three knights are related in considerable detail, and the efforts of the lady's brother to dispose of the corpses involve him in a number of awkward and perilous adventures.

Of these two chap-book versions the American is inferior both in mechanical details and in narrative construction, and is plainly a condensation of the longer prose version. Both illustrate the vogue which the *Seven Wise Masters* enjoyed as late as the eighteenth century, and the practice of combining with these stories other popular moralizing material.

D. F. BOND

The University of Chicago

ADDISON AND THE PLEASURES OF THE IMAGINATION

Recent critics have pointed out that the praise lavished by Worsfold and others on the *Spectator* papers on the Pleasures of the Imagination is in excess of their merits.¹ There is another aspect

¹⁵ Pp. 40-42.

¹ Cf. Saintsbury, *History of English Criticism* (Edinburgh, 1925), 177-91; Croce, *Estetica* (Bari, 1912), 236; E. K. Broadus, *Addison as a Literary Critic* (unpublished Harvard dissertation, 1908), *passim*. For a recent recrudescence of the view of Addison as a revolutionary esthetician, see J. G. Robertson, *The Genesis of Romantic Theory* (Cambridge, 1923), 241 f.

of these papers, hitherto unobserved, an examination of which will reveal a further superficiality in Addison's esthetic thought.

Addison himself assures the reader that the foundation for his idea of the imagination is Locke's distinction between primary and secondary qualities of matter.² It has accordingly been assumed that Addison's distinction between primary and secondary pleasures of the imagination is identical, on the esthetic level, with that of Locke.³ Close analysis of the *Spectator* papers in question will show that such an assumption is ill-founded.

Primary pleasures of the imagination [says Addison] entirely proceed from such objects as are before our eyes; . . . secondary pleasures of the imagination flow from the ideas of visible objects, when the objects are not actually before the eyes, but are called up into our memories, or formed into agreeable visions of things that are absent or fictitious.⁴

This is not Locke's distinction, since according to that philosopher all visual sensations are subjective. Ideas are distinguished by Locke "as they are ideas or perceptions in our minds, and as they are modifications of matter in the bodies that cause perceptions in us." The first he calls secondary qualities of bodies (colors, sounds, etc.); the latter, primary (bulk, figure, etc.).⁵

Nor is Addison consistent in the application of his distinction. The primary pleasures of the imagination arise, according to him, from the perception of visual objects that are present to the beholder. Yet under the category of secondary pleasures he treats those arising from artifacts (poems, pictures, statues), which are, obviously, also present objects.⁶ In the preceding papers, however, he had considered the effects arising from the contemplation of artifacts under primary pleasures of the imagination.⁷ From one point of view, therefore, both Nature and the productions of the plastic arts ought to be included under the enumeration of the efficient causes of the primary pleasures, while the recollection of visual sensations and the imagery evoked by the reading of poetry

² Cf. end of *Spectator* 413.

³ Robertson, *op. cit.*, 247 f.

⁴ *Spectator* 411, paragraph 3.

⁵ *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, ed. A. C. Fraser (Oxford, 1894), I, 168 ff.

⁶ Cf. *Spectator* 416 ff.

⁷ *Spectator* 414.

ought to be restricted to the causes of the secondary pleasures—this on the principle laid down in the sentences from *Spectator* 411 quoted above. But from another point of view Nature alone ought to stand as the object of the primary pleasures, since it alone has no prototype to which we can compare it, while all the arts, plastic and expressive, being imitative of, or at least limited to the materials found in, Nature, ought to have their place under the secondary pleasures. Addison has, in short, not made clear to himself whether it is objective immediacy which distinguishes primary from secondary causes of imaginative pleasure, or, to employ the term rather specially, originality, meaning absence of imitativeness.⁸

VICTOR M. HAMM

College of Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio

THE FATE OF JAMES THOMSON'S *EDWARD AND ELEANORA*

This article is by way of an addendum to Mr. Allardyce Nicoll's statement about this ill-fated play in his excellent book, *A History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama, 1700-1750*. When he discusses some of the plays which were forbidden to be acted in the year 1739, Mr. Nicoll says, "Brooke's *Gustavus Vasa* (1739) was banned possibly with some show of justice; but there does not seem to have been such justice in the treatment of the poet Thomson, whose *Edward and Eleanora* was banned the same year."¹ On the contrary, there seem to have been very excellent reasons, both external and internal, why the play was banned.

To begin with, Thomson was a pensioner of Frederick, the Prince of Wales.² This fact in itself is important because of a

⁸ That Addison's very superficiality led succeeding thinkers to make sounder analyses of his problems is evident, for instance, from Hutcheson's *Inquiry into the Original of Our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue*. Hutcheson clarifies just that distinction which Addison left confused. Cf. the *Inquiry* (London, 1725), pp. 13 ff., esp. pp. 15, 35.

¹ Allardyce Nicoll, *A History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama, 1700-1750*, p. 23.

² *Biographia Dramatica*, eds. David E. Baker, Isaac Reed, and Stephen

violent quarrel between the Prince of Wales and his father George II. There had been an open breach between the two as early as 1734 over both the choice of a wife for the Prince, and the touchy matter of the Prince's allowance,³ but the quarrel reached its climax in 1738.⁴ At the time Thomson's play appeared in 1739, the Prince was still living in an enforced exile from the Court. Thomson, since he was chiefly dependent on the Prince of Wales, could be expected to side with his benefactor. Nor would his attachment to the Prince make Thomson popular with the King's party or the Licensor who was its agent. For ever since Walpole's Licensing Act of 1737, the Licensor had a political function to perform in banning plays which were hostile to the king or to the ministry in power.⁵ Thus any play by a dependent of the refractory Prince would be suspect of the court Licensor.⁶

Besides these external facts, there is evidence within the play itself which aids in explaining why it was banned. It was dedicated to the Princess of Wales with the assurance from Thomson that in the character of Eleanora I have endeavoured to represent, however faintly, a Princess distinguished for all the virtues that render greatness

Jones (London, 1812), I, 711. For a brief account of Thomson's life, see *DNB*.

³ For an historical account of this quarrel, see William E. H. Lecky, *A History of England in the Eighteenth Century* (New Edition, New York, 1892), I, 447 ff.; or C. Grant Robertson, *England Under the Hanoverians* (New York and London, 1927), pp. 72-73. An excellent contemporary account can be found in John, Lord Hervey's, *Memoirs in the Reign of George II*, ed. Romney Sedgwick (London, 1931), III, 756-793.

⁴ On the night his first child was born, Prince Frederick, in defiance of the King's order, hurried his wife away from Hampton Court and the jurisdiction of the crown. For this arrogance, George II ordered the guard to be taken from his son's door and forbade the Court to visit the Prince. See Robertson, p. 73.

⁵ John Genest, *Some Account of the English Stage from the Restoration in 1660 to 1830*, III, 222-223, explains that the Licensing Act was occasioned by thrusts at Sir Robert Walpole and his ministry in such plays as Fielding's *Pasquin* and the seemingly anonymous *Golden Rump*. Indeed there were arguments as early as 1735 in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, V, 192, for the regulation of the stage.

⁶ In fact the "show of justice" in banning Brooke's *Gustavus Vasa* was that it contained a Prologue championing the Prince of Wales. For an able discussion of the political allusions in Brooke's play, see Helen M. Scurr, *Henry Brooke* (University of Minnesota Doctoral Thesis, 1922), pp. 65 ff.

amiable I have aimed particularly to do justice to her inviolable affection and generous tenderness for a Prince, who was the darling of a great and free people.

In addition to this suggested parallel between the mythical crown prince and princess of the play, and Prince Frederick and Princess Augusta, Thomson makes a specific reference in the text to a quarrel between the heir to the throne and his father.

Has not the royal heir a juster claim
To share his father's inmost heart and counsels,
Than aliens to his interest, those who make
A property, a market of his honour? ⁷

This might well be taken from the mouth of any of the discontented politicians who gathered about Prince Frederick at Carlton House in 1739, and chafed at the influence which Walpole enjoyed at Court. Moreover later in the play Thomson makes a more derogatory reference to the King, when the mythical Edward, notified of the death of Henry III, exclaims,

O my deluded father! little joy
Hadst thou in life, led from thy real good
And genuine glory, from the people's love,
The richest aim of Kings, by smiling traitors ⁸

It is understandable that the Licenser would not care to be identified as one of the "smiling traitors," nor could he give countenance to this slur on the King.

Thus the external fact of Thompson's dependence on the Prince of Wales at a time when the latter was in disrepute at Court, together with these allusions in the play itself to a quarrel between the King and his heir, furnish enough evidence to explain adequately why the Licenser felt there was some show of "justice" in banning Thomson's *Edward and Eleanor*.

JEAN B. KERN

Iowa City, Iowa

⁷ *Edward and Eleanor* (1739), I, ii.

⁸ *Ibid.*, IV, vii

THE PUBLICATION DATE, AND SOURCE OF BYRON'S
"TRANSLATION OF A ROMAIC LOVE SONG"

The Wise bibliography of Byron, as well as the Coleridge-Prothero edition and all other editions that I have checked, gives the date of publication of "Translation of a Romaic Love Song" as "*Childe Harold*, 1814 (Seventh Edition)." As a matter of fact, the poem first appeared in J. C. Hobhouse's *Journey through Albania* (1813), pp. 1148-1150. Printed at the end of the volume, the poem is introduced thus: "The following translation of a Romaic love-song, which is given in Dr. Pouqueville's volume on the Morea, has just been transmitted to me by my friend Lord Byron; and I have only to regret, that it did not arrive in time to be inserted in its proper place in the Appendix." I have not seen the original edition of Pouqueville, but Profs. Lancaster and Malakis inform me that the Greek text, followed by a translation into French, is found in I, 282-6, of F. C. H. L. Pouqueville, *Voyage en Morée, à Constantinople, en Albanie, et dans plusieurs parties de l'Empire Othoman*, Paris, Gabon, 1805. The text in Hobhouse's volume contains several minor variations in punctuation and capitalization, and in the third line a major variation in grammar: *rends* reads *rend*.

ROY P. BASLER

State Teachers College
Florence, Alabama

WORDSWORTH'S "UNIMAGINABLE TOUCH OF TIME"

For one of his finest phrases, "the unimaginable touch of Time," Wordsworth was apparently indebted to Milton since the sonnet "Mutability" seems to be related in a subtle and complex manner to that passage in Milton's *Of Education* which speaks of

Musick heard or learnt; either while the skilful Organist plies his grave and fancied descant, in lofty fugues, or the whole Symphony with artful and *unimaginable touches* adorn and grace the well studied chords of some choice composer.¹

Not only do the "unimaginable touches" of Milton's symphony

¹ Columbia *Milton*, IV, 288. The italics are mine.

find a place in the sonnet, but Wordsworth imaged the action of mutability in terms of a musical composition:

From low to high doth dissolution climb,
And sinks from high to low, along a scale
Of awful notes, whose concord shall not fail

Whether, having achieved the metaphor of music to express the secret workings of dissolution, he arrived through the process of association at the application of the "unimaginable touch" to Time, or whether Milton's phrase was the germ out of which grew the "musical but melancholy chime" of decay, we cannot say. But it is probable that Wordsworth remembered Milton's words and that they somehow influenced the imagery and the phrasing of his sonnet.

SAMUEL H. MONK

Southwestern College

FORSTER AS LANDOR'S LITERARY EXECUTOR

The pompousness of Forster's claims to the literary executorship of Landor's works, together with the unsatisfactory manner in which he performed the task, have made more than one scholar wish he could disprove those claims, but they seem well fortified, among other things by the letter Forster quotes in the Preface to the "Works and Life of Walter Savage Landor" (London, 1876), professedly on Landor's explicit instruction. "You may live," the letter is asserted to read, "to superintend such edition or Selection from my writings as may be called for after my death." Virtually, Landor has given him power to determine which of his works should survive; and such indeed is the power Forster exercised in bringing out the edition.

But the letter itself, in Landor's handwriting, is preserved in the Forster collection, South Kensington Museum, tucked under the cover of the first volume of the "Imaginary Conversations," which volume, like its four companions, has been carefully revised, and filled with scraps of paper containing corrections and additions. And quite different is the sentence singled out above: Landor

really wrote, "You may live to superintend a new edition of my Imaginary Conversations, with a volume added to the original five." Punctuation excepted, the printed letter differs from the original only in one other respect: whereas it is actually subscribed "Yours very sincerely," Forster would have it "Yours very affectionately."

This is by no means the only place where Forster deliberately misquotes letters in his work, nor is the reason always so apparent. In the second volume of the "Biography" (1869), on p. 7, Wordsworth is supposed to have written, "In a tract of yours which I saw some years ago at Mr. Southey's, I was struck by a piece on the War of the Titans, and I was pleased to find also rather an out-of-the-way image in which the present hour is compared to the shade on the dial." To this Forster adds a note to explain what was meant by the "piece on the War of the Titans" But Wordsworth's actual letter reads at this point, "In your *Simoneida* [*sic*], which I saw some years ago at Mr. Southey's I was pleased to find rather an out-of-the-way image" etc. No mention of the "War of the Titans"! One would suppose that a footnote correcting Wordsworth's error would have been as gratifying to Forster's vanity as the one he adds to interpret the phrase of his own invention. (The comparison occurs in "Poetry by the Author of Gebir," 1802, p. 56, and not in the "*Simonidea*," 1806.)

Again, Forster carefully conceals the traces of asperity shown by Robert Eyres Landor toward his elder brother even after Walter's death. The "Biography" (vol. II, p. 501) purports to "transcribe" a marginal comment of the former on the verse-tribute paid him by his elder brother, but, in addition to less important changes (R. E. Landor states that the Living cost £5,500, instead of £6,000, and he does not mention the source of that purchase-money), it omits a sentence which is characteristic of the whole attitude of these marginal notes: "But my Brother was too much accustomed to talk about Charity, often in a less Charitable Spirit than at present." More amusing is the comment Robert Landor makes on the Spanish campaign of his brother: he asserts that Walter was indeed present at the Battle of Rio Seco, "and he ran away with the rest before it began." Actually, Blake was defeated at Rio Seco on July 14, 1808, and Landor arrived in Spain almost six weeks later. The note was written at least fifty-seven

years after the event, in the margin of an article in the *London Quarterly Review* (vol. xxiv, April, 1865, pp. 171-206), now to be found in the Forster collection, South Kensington (as is the letter of Wordsworth), and its interest lies not in the information about Walter, but in what it reveals of his younger brother's attitude toward him.

The alteration of Landor's letter to himself does not, of course, disprove Forster's claim to the literary executorship; it merely invalidates one bit of evidence. But, taken in conjunction with the numerous other instances of his high-handed treatment of documents, of which only a few are cited here, it points to the need of a careful investigation of as many of the sources as survive, and of regarding with perpetual scepticism what cannot be verified.

ROBERT H. SUPER

Worcester College, Oxford

DIE SONNE GEHT ZU GNADEN

Prof. Kurrelmeyer (*MLN*, 1937, S. 373) meint, die Bedeutungsangabe von Simon Roth (1571-2): *Occident* 'Nidergang, das ort da die Sonn nider oder zu *genaden gehet*' sei ein Druckfehler für *zu Gadem gehen* 'Besuch machen.' Doch ist zu sagen, dass es schon ein mhd. *die sonne gie zu gnâden* gibt (Lexer, Kluge) und dass die Wendung sich auch in modernen Dialekten erhalten hat (Fischer, *Schweiz. Idiotikon*, Schmeller). Einige dieser Wbb. nehmen Zusammenhang mit *nied*, *neder* an, wie es ja auch dem Sprachgefühl Roths nahezu liegen scheint. Kluge-Gotze knupfen an eine Wz. germ. **nēþ*, ai. *nāthá* 'Hilfe, Zuflucht' an, wobei von 'sich zur Hilfe neigen' ein jungeres 'sich neigen' entwickelt ware. Das ist nun wenig wahrscheinlich, da die Redensart z. B. im Schweizerdeutschen neben einer anderen, offenbar allgemeinen und geläufigeren Bedeutung sich findet: H. Paul sagt schon: "Die Bedeutung 'Gemachlichkeit,' 'Ruhe' (zu Gnaden kommen) ist . . . abgeleitet (Zustand, in dem man Schonung geniesst)," "Sie (die Gnade) wird von dem hoher Gestellten dem niedriger Stehenden . . . , von Gott dem Sünder und nach der Lehre von der Gnadenwahl dem Menschen überhaupt erwiesen" und das Schweizer

Idiotikon belegt neben der Redensart *zu Gnaden* die uns hier interessierende *zu Gnaden gehen* 'sterben,' worin *Gnade* die 'himmlische Seligkeit' bedeutet wie im mhd. *sîn sêle ist, kam ze gnâden*. Dem Romanisten fällt sofort rumän. *soarele asfinţeste* 'die Sonne geht unter' (auch von Mond und Sternen gesagt) ein, wozu das Dictionar al limbii române von Şaieanu bemerkt (ich übersetze): "Cf. *sfântul soare* 'die heilige Sonne': das Verschwinden oder der anscheinende Tod der Sonne ist als eine Heiligung des Gestirns angesehen." Richtiger ist wohl die Auffassung, das Farbenspiel der untergehenden Sonne bedeute für den Christen eine Art Abwandlung oder Vorspiel der Himmelsglorie, wo die Neugriechen im Sonnenuntergang mehr den weltlichen Glanz eines irdischen Königs sehen (*ὁ ἥλιος βασιλεύει*, doch vgl. Verf., *Rev. des études balkaniques*, 1936).

Der 'Tod der Sonne' ist verklart durch ein christliches Wiederauferstehen in schöneren Sphären, die ihren Abglanz auf die Erde senden. Die Sonne kann für den Christen nicht anders als 'fromm' 'in Gnaden' sterben. Auch an den Heiligenschein kann man denken: Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*, S. 269 und 601 erwähnt die Tacitusstelle, die besagt, die Sonne lasse beim Untergang "so lichten glanz hinter sich, dass er bis zum morgen die sterne bleiche . . . *formas deorum et radios capitis aspici*," "die strahlenden haupter seien gleichsam ein heiligenschein," indem bei Griechen wie Germanen der Strahlenkranz oder Nimbus den Menschen wie den Gestirnen zugeschrieben wird: "Druckten die strahlen ursprünglich den höchsten begriff göttlicher, leuchtender schönheit aus?" Bekanntlich ist ja der soldatische Gruss ein Rest dieser Anerkennung des überirdischen Glanzes der begrüßten Persönlichkeit: ¹ "das Aug' erblindet vor deiner Schönheit Glanz," wie es im Textbuch von Goldmarks "Königin von Saba" heisst. Die Aureole der Heiligen ist Strahlenglanz der Gestirne—warum sollten die Gestirne nicht den Strahlenkranz der Heiligen bekommen?—*Lo*

¹ Vgl. Lerch, *Neue Jahrbücher f. Wiss. u. Jugendbildung*, 1926, S. 345, der an das iranische *hvarenô*, den Nimbus des Herrschers erinnert, der von Persien über Alexander den Grossen und Rom zu den Herrschern ('Euer Gnaden') des Abendlands gewandert sei.—Über die Himmelsglorie, feiner die malerisch dargestellte Öffnung des Himmels, durch die die Paradiesesstrahlen brechen, das Malerische des Wortes bei Baudelaire (*la gloire d'un ciel pur où frémit l'éternelle chaleur*) und die Glorie als Rahmen für Heiligenbilder vgl. Rheinfelder, *Kultsprache u. Profansprache*, S. 285.

d'aller et retour, wie ein französischer Semantiker (Esnault) derlei genannt hat.

Eine noch schlagendere Parallele aber zu dem deutschen Ausdruck ist ein *sol floret*, das Tagliavini, *A grammatical miscellany offered to Otto Jespersen* (1930) S. 413 im Ladinisch der Dolomiten (er sagt in seinem Titel zu Unrecht: "Il 'tramonto del sole' in alcuni dialetti dell'Italia Settentrionale") gefunden hat und aus *floret* = *nitet* erklären will. In Wirklichkeit liegt die Vorstellung von der Wiederauferstehung vor. Bédier hat im Kommentar seiner Ausgabe des Rolandsliedes zu V. 1856 "les saintes fleurs de Paradis" die *Distinctiones* des Alanus ab Insulis unter *hortus* erwähnt: "*Hortus* dicitur *vita aeterna*," unter *florere* "*Florere* significat *resurgere*. Unde in Psalmo de Christo dicitur *Et floruit caro mea, id est resurrexit. Florere* notat *rosam martyrum* . . ." Für eine "christomorphe" Betrachtung der Naturvorgänge stirbt die Sonne nicht, um wiederaufzuerstehen, sondern *sterbend* *ersteht* sie wieder.

LEO SPITZER

The Johns Hopkins University

AN EXAMPLE OF VOWEL-HARMONY IN A YOUNG CHILD

The language of my child Padmint (twenty-one months) affords an interesting example of a spontaneous tendency to vowel-harmony. I have noted the following examples: ['baba]¹ name for a chair (from its trade-name *buffer*); ['baga] 'sleeping-bag'; ['baga] adv. 'back'; ['aba], ['aBa], ['aba], ['abo] 'up'; ['mago] 'mug'; ['bə: de] 'bird'; ['boko] (i) 'frock' (ii) 'box'; ['dogo] name for a toy dog; ['poto] 'pot'; ['təpə], ['dopə] 'top'; ['bə: də] 'water'; ['wə: kə], ['bə: kə], ['bə: gə] 'walk'; ['buku], ['bugu], [bu'gu] 'book'; ['koutu] 'coat', ['bihi] 'beach'; ['biki] (i) 'biscuit' (ii) 'toy brick'; ['dlinki] 'drink'; ['bi: di] 'beads'; ['pı: wi] sb. 'sweet.' The pattern for all these is clearly the common "nurses' diminutive" in -y e.g. *baggy*, *uppy*, *doggy*, *booky* etc. so that the forms with a front vowel must be discounted as not necessarily spontaneous. But those with a back vowel must be

¹ Here and throughout the article the apostrophe marks the position of the stress.

spontaneous (since the heard forms have a uniform front vowel in the ending) and are due to a tendency to vowel-harmony. The vowel-harmony is not however complete, as can be seen from forms such as ['duwsi] 'orange-juice,' ['puhɪ] 'cat'; but these forms are doubtless due to the influence of the heard forms *juicy*, *pussy*. That the nature of the vowel-harmony is essentially assimilative is clearly shown by forms such as ['fugu] 'sugar', ['beɪ'beɪ] 'baby', ['peɪpeɪ], ['beɪpeɪ], ['beɪbeɪ] 'paper' in which the assimilation is complete.

ALAN S. C. ROSS

University of Leeds

BALLAST-HILL, BRIDEGROOM, COMMON BAIL, AND STEEL

The following usages, which are not given in *NED*, are taken from the periodical, *The Universal Visiter, and Monthly Memorialist*, London, 1756. Italics are mine.

Ballast-hill, sb 'A hill from which ballast is taken, or to which ballast is carried for disposal' The Mercury of Lynn, capt Noel, lying at Howden-Pans in this river, [at Newcastle] had her masts split, and otherwise greatly shiver'd, a piece of one of her masts was found about 140 yards from the ship, sticking perpendiculary [sic] in a *ballast-hill*. (July) p 336

Bridegroom, adj 'One who attends, or serves, the bride and bridegroom' The young couple had 200 *bridegroom* men and maidens. (June) p 297

Common bail, sb. 'People who make it their business to bail for hire.' At the court of the King's Bench, last term, two men . . . were committed to prison, on affidavit made of their being *common bail*, i.e persons who make it their business to bail for hire, falsely swearing they are Housekeepers, and men of substance, by which infamous practice numbers of honest people have been defrauded of just debts (Nov.) p. 537.

Steel, sb 'A reef, or bar.' Thursday se'nnight about six in the evening, the Providence, of London . . . in ballast, for Tynemouth, struck on Whitburn *steel*, and did not get off before Saturday morning at six, when they fortunately cleared it, with a calm sea and slow wind, otherwise the vessel must have gone in pieces. (Dec) p. 575.

CLAUDE JONES

University of California at Los Angeles

REVIEWS

A History of the Anglo-Saxons. By R. H. HODGKIN. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935. Vol. I, pp. xxvii + 382e, Vol. II, pp. xii + 383-748. \$10.00.

I

Mr. Hodgkin has written a fine and useful book on the history of the English people from the first intimations of their existence on the Continent to the death of Alfred, based on the most recent findings of a great variety of disciplines, whose combined resources are gradually making possible an intelligent writing of the history of the Dark Ages. Archaeology, philology in moderation, and history—religious, legal, constitutional, social and military are pressed into service; good account is taken of recent place-name study (e. g. see Index, p. 742 under *-ing, -ingas*) and of the revelations of airphotography in laying bare ancient roadways and fields (cp. esp. pp. 134-35). The artistic achievements of our ancestors are richly represented in drawings, photographs and magnificent colored plates. There is an abundance of maps, many specially drawn, which illustrate the archaeological, religious, and military history of the island. Genealogical (p. 719 f.) and chronological (p. 724 f.) tables orient the reader and serve to fill in minor intentional omissions in the text of the narrative. *A History of the Anglo-Saxons* is a most attractively printed book.

Mr. Hodgkin's history is valuable perhaps first and foremost for the reason that much of the materials mentioned above has for the first time been prepared for presentation to the beginner in the study of the origins of the English people. Much that has hitherto lain buried in professional journals and specialized monographs is now digested for lay consumption. Advisedly Mr. Hodgkin writes with many words, with the expressed purpose of lightening the reading of complicated exposition (s. Preface, p. vii); a closely economical style is forbidding to all but the specialist and might here repel just those readers for whom the book is so admirably suited. Supplementing previous general works on the same period Mr. Hodgkin's book becomes overnight the first history to put in the hands of the serious beginning student of *any* aspect of English life before the death of Alfred. Many a more mature student will find here refreshment and a stimulating synthesis of what he may already know piecemeal, or at any rate ought to know.

Vol. I (chs. I-IX) takes us from the Ingaevonic tribes to the death of Bede in 735; vol. II (chs. X-XX) to the death of Alfred in 899 (s. p. 668). The early chapters, making much use of recent

archaeological finds both on the Continent and in England, deal with the varied and difficult problems of the original home of the English, the romanization and deromanization of Britain, the point or points of departure from the Continent to England, the routes taken by the invading colonists from the coast inland, the perplexing problem of the Jutes, and the foundation of the various Germanic kingdoms. Usually followed by an independent critical judgment, nearly all important conflicting views on most points are set forth, e. g. the date of the '*advent*' of the English according to Nennius, the Gaulish Chronicle, and Bede (see pp. 66-68 and notes). Though the author properly remarks that 'for the time being the Germanic conquest of Britain cannot be told as a narrative' (p. 75) and observes that 'the story of the Conquest was more complicated than ever was imagined by the historians who wrote before the evidence of the graves had been well sifted' (pp. 155-56), his frequent excellent summaries of important events and movements and appraisals of character, e. g. the decline of Roman Britain (p. 180 ff.), the beginnings of the Anglian settlements (pp. 147 ff.), the supremacy of Wessex (p. 412 f.) and of the person of Alfred the Great (p. 686-87), show insight and an ability to make synthetic observations. No reader with feeling for the past of his people will close the two stately volumes without an enhanced appreciation of the first adventures and the remarkable spiritual achievements of the founders of England.

II

While any attempt at a detailed survey of the contents of Mr. Hodgkin's work is beyond the scope of the present review, brief note may be taken of certain quite fundamental matters of point of view which serve to exhibit the forward-looking character of the book. In times when much attention is being given to fundamental trends and attitudes of the past, it is encouraging to find the author well on the side of those who would dispel once and for all the notion of any sort of general Germanic or Old-English parliamentary freedom (p. 211 ff.). Mr. Hodgkin makes it abundantly clear that the freedom of the early Germanic peoples lay in something quite beyond voting and debate in a *witena gemōt*, rather within the framework of a leader-principle, of unfaltering loyalty and disciplined obedience to leaders (cp. pp. 34, 202-03, 507 last paragraph, and 607), whose authority rested not on autocratic dictatorship but on a keen sense of full responsibility to their people (cp. p. 395-96). Success followed where these virtues maintained (cp. p. 507 on Viking discipline and cooperation), failure where dividing independence became the order of the day (cp. p. 529). In view of the author's apparently clear perception of these matters, one wonders at his obliquely derogatory reference (Pref., p. v) to Germany.

The decadence of the church in the years after Bede's death (chs. XI, XII) is treated with stress on the 'proud barbarians' (p. 431) resistance to various non-Germanic elements in the imported Christianity, a reaction so marked and by the author clearly recognized in the treatment of Biblical themes in Old-English poetry (see excerpt from the OE *Judith*, p. 569). Against the generally satisfactory relations between church and state (pp. 455-56)—which may, by the way, be explained by a relative absence of political Catholicism (see p. 451)—, one might with justice set forth far more strongly than does Mr. Hodgkin (p. 421) the corruption of the monasteries (where financial probity—p. 423 on the comparative absence of simony—scarcely seems to offset other failings, p. 417 f.) and the extensive alienation of land to the church with its fatal political effects (pp. 456-57).

Counteracting the romantic emphasis on the horrors of the Scandinavian invasions and on the implied unculture of the Norsemen, considerable space is devoted to a picture of the high culture and advanced civilization of 'The Northmen at Home' (pp. 498 ff.), the importance of the Viking ships as a phase in the development of naval architecture is without exaggeration described as 'the decisive invention of the eighth and ninth centuries' (p. 506).

III

The final section of the present review is not concerned with an appraisal of *A History of the Anglo-Saxons*, rather with a few practical *trivia* and as follows:

Without exception place-names not the names of county-seats should be followed by the unobtrusive county-abbreviations of the English Place-Name Society. In the early history of England many places are mentioned and hence important which today are all but unknown except locally: without a Bartholomew's *Survey Gazetteer* one is unlikely to know that Woodcuts (p. 38) is a hamlet in Dorsetshire. Lydney (p. 49), Fairford and Cirencester (p. 109) and Dyrham (p. 190) are, for example, unquestionably less well located in the minds of most readers than is the county of Gloucestershire in which they are situated; so Frilford (Berks) and East Shefford (Beds) (p. 110). The treatment of Roman place-names is not consistent, in every instance where Romano-British geography is in question we should have either the Roman name followed by the English name (with county!) or vice versa. E. g. on p. 45 let us have Margidunum (Castle Hill, Nt), pp. 141, 144 Verulam (St. Albans, Herts), etc. *Lordis* (p. 150), is probably 'Leeds, YW' (see E. Ekwall, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*, Oxford, 1936).

Frequent mention is made of a group of documents which might better be designated invariably as *The Old-English Annals*; in the present work they are cited miscellaneously in at least *six* different

ways: *Alfredian Chronicle(s)* (pp. 105 and fn., 108, 125, 187, 373, n. 36), *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (pp. 140, 164, 481), *Chronicle* (pp. 81, 109, 125, 173, 187, 374, n. 64, 584), *Englsh Chronicle* (p. 498), *Saxon Chronicle* (pp. 75, 81, 96, 103, 177, 186, 517), and *West-Saxon Chronicle* (p. 410). Several documents are here involved, with the exception of the *F*-text (Latin and OE) they are written in OE, and they are 'annals'—by all means *The Old-English Annals*, so, too, the Parker Annals, Worcester Annals, Peterborough Annals etc. vs. Mercian Chronicle (p. 410).

The word 'race' might be considered as inappropriately used on pp. 99 and 572 to distinguish Germanic tribes from one another, and dubiously on pp. 164, 170, 173, 177, and 613 to distinguish Germanic from Celtic peoples, in such cases 'folk(s)' as on p. 535 or 'nation' as on p. 101 or 'tribe' would be preferable. On p. 173 'racial' is correctly used vs. pp. 159, 579 and 694 where 'national' or 'tribal' is really meant. A racial distinction to mean anything at all must mean something far deeper than any conceivable differences among Germanic tribes or between German and Celt (see p. 173 top and additional note pp. 383*d-e*).

It is time to drop the name-form 'Nennius' and adopt with Thurneysen 'Nemnius': see p. 59 fn and pp. 369-70, n. 4, the world of scholarship is young enough to correct itself.

Miscellaneous note the following: In general see now chs. I-IV of H. C. Darby, *An Historical Geography of England before A. D. 1800* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1936). Pp. 29 f comment on *Widsith* must henceforth take full cognizance of Kemp Malone's edition (Methuen, London, 1936). P. 61, for 'Gaelic-speaking' read 'Pictish-speaking'; the linguistic barrier suggested does not seem very significant. P. 75, in general connection with the *OE Annals* ('Saxon Chronicle,' l. 2 from bottom) bibliographical notice should be taken of M. Hoffmann-Hirtz's richly annotated *Une chronique anglosaxonne d'après le manuscrit 173 de Corpus Christi College, Cambridge* (Strasbourg, 1933). P. 78, the discussion of Horsted (K) is probably wrong (s. Ekwall, *op. cit.*, "Horsted"). P. 81, Crecganford, probably an error for *Cræganford*, is Crayford (K). P. 119, l. 2 from bottom, the ambiguous 'double burial' seems merely to refer to the 'two graves at Dorchester (O),' mentioned on p. 109. P. 127, l. 2, on *Wiltgāraburh* see Malone, *Anglia Beibl.*, XLVII (1936), 219-220. P. 140, n. 45, I can see no trace of an old poem here (nor p. 187) nor do I find Haverfield's idea jeopardized by an acceptance of the annual on its face-value, a ruined town might offer an excellent retreat. P. 146, a note on *Seaxnēat* (better *Saxnôt* here) would be in order, cp. Jan de Vries, *Germanische Mythologie* (Berlin, de Gruyter, 1935), I, 237-38. P. 151, l. 2 from bottom, read 'passage in Bede' P. 152, read 'Irish' or 'Irish-Scottish missionaries' and p. 694 for "half-Scottish" read 'half-Irish.' P. 153, bottom, read 'Anglo-

Irish culture'; 'Celtic' is too inclusive. P. 163, l. 2, for Viroconium probably read Uroconium and see Darby, *op. cit.*, p. 58, n. 1. P. 166, middle, 'of which we have spoken' calls for a cross-reference to p. 110. P. 173, l. 9 from bottom, 'next stage' apparently refers to pp 184 ff ("second stage"). P. 174, 'detached' or 'separate' (as on p. 204-5) would seem preferable as a rendering of 'einzeln' to 'isolated' used here (is not 'isolated' a Gallicism? cp. Fr. *maison isolée* 'a detached house'). P. 187, for 'German(s)', here and p. 196 read 'English'; on p. 192 does 'Germanism' mean 'Germanentum' (Germanic ways)?

Pp. 201 ff. note F. B. Gummere, *The Founders of England* (rev. ed., G. Stechert: New York, 1931), *passim*. P. 204, is 'gaus' an acceptable plural in English for Germ. *Gau*, pl. *Gaue*? P. 226, on the Casket cite P. W. Souers, 'The Top of the Franks Casket,' *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, xvii (1934), 163 ff. P. 230, on the realia in the Riddles see Erika von Erhardt-Siebold, *Die lateinischen Ratsel der Angelsachsen* (Anglist. Forschungen, nr. 61, Heidelberg, 1925). P. 232, l. 6 from bottom, the implication that Beowulf was not strong in mind is not born out by the text of the poem. P. 240, l. 4 from bottom, cancel 'unlovely' as meaningless; read perhaps 'mysterious.' P. 263, l. 1, see A. S. Cook, *Augustine's Journey from Rome to Richborough*, *Speculum*, I (1926), 375-397. P. 279, 'Heavenfield' is unidentified and should be left Hefenfelth (Bede, *H. E.* iii, 2). P. 293, the figure of 'growing pains' does not seem apposite. P. 295, a note on the Strensall vs. Whitby identification of Bede's *Streaneshalch* would be in order, then either Strensall or Whitby thereafter (as on p. 444). P. 303, consistency calls for 'Synod of Whitby' as above. P. 325, *Praise of Virginity* is literal and traditional but not good; better would be *Praise of the Monastic Life*, or perhaps of *Monastic Chastity*. P. 354, middle, it might be noted that Bede greatly admired Aldhelm's writing (*H. E.* v, 18). P. 385, Beorgfeord cannot be equated with Burford (O) and must for the present at least be put down as an unidentified site. P. 393 ff. on the episode of Cynewulf and Cyneheard see *Anglia*, xlv (1933), 24 ff.

P. 401, *unius familiae* 'of one family.' P. 423, for 'at least three duties: *fyrdfare*, *bricgbot*' read 'the *trimoda necessitas*: *fyrdfaru*, *brycgbot*' and reference to p. 453 and 456 n.; similar correction p. 587, l. 2 from bottom and enlargement of entry in Index s. v. *Trimoda necessitas*; see also 'Trinoda necessitas' in Hoops' *Reallexikon*. P. 458, for 'Cædmonic' read 'Cædmonian.' P. 459, bottom, the rune equals 'K.' P. 460-68 *passim*, read *Dream of for Vision of the Rood*. P. 466 f. on the OE Charms add to note 19 (p. 699) a reference to Felix Grendon, 'The Anglo-Saxon Charms,' *Journal of American Folklore*, xxii (1909), 105-275 (anastatic reprint, G. Stechert, New York, 1930). P. 467,

l. 3 from bottom, for 'recipe . . . fertile' read 'famous Land-Charm,' Grendon, *ed. cit.*, A 13. P. 468, bottom, cross-reference to pp. 276-77 where the whole passage from Bede should be quoted. P. 470, for 'the Saxon language' l. 9, read 'English' or 'Old English.' The OE *Genesis B* can scarcely be said to anticipate 'much' of Milton's *Paradise Lost*. P. 482, n. 12, on the Hamlet tradition see Kemp Malone, *The Literary History of Hamlet. I. The Early Tradition* (Anglist. Forschungen, Nr. 59, Heidelberg, 1923). P. 496, l. 14, for 'Romans' read 'Germans' or 'English.'

P. 503 ff., on the legend of Ragnar Lodbrog see Grant Loomis, *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, xiv (1932), 83 ff. and xv (1933), 1 ff. P. 549, l. 18, for 'national army' read 'English fyrd.'

F. P. MAGOUN, JR.

Harvard University

The Allegory of Love: a Study in Medieval Tradition. By C. S. LEWIS. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936. Pp. viii + 378. Cloth, \$5.00.

No one who is in the least interested in the history of medieval sentiment can afford to neglect Mr. Lewis's brilliant study of the allegory of love. The scope of the book may be sufficiently indicated by noting the chapter headings. I. Courtly Love; II. Allegory; III. *The Romance of the Rose*; IV. Chaucer; V. Gower. Thomas Usk; VI. Allegory as the Dominant Form; VII. *The Faerie Queene*. Two appendices are devoted to "Genius and Genius" and "Danger" respectively, words which may easily be misunderstood by the modern reader of medieval and renaissance literature.

The opening chapter on courtly love is of particular importance; its forty-three pages offer the best general discussion of the subject available in English, even though there is no mention of the vexing problem of origins (save "every one knows that it appears quite suddenly at the end of the eleventh century in Languedoc"). The characteristics of the sentiment are Humility, Courtesy, Adultery, and the Religion of Love, four elements that serve to distinguish most of the love poetry written during the Middle Ages. But this should not lead us to think of courtly love as a sentiment which flourished for a century or so and was then forgotten. Mr. Lewis emphasizes this fact very properly when he notes that many of its features have formed the background of European literature down to very recent times. By their emphasis on romantic passion the Troubadours brought about a change tantamount to revolution in many phases of our emotional life. It is realization of this fact which makes the author declare (p. 4) that "compared with this

revolution the Renaissance is a mere ripple on the surface of literature."

The paradox of Ovid's ironic treatment of love and the seriousness with which medieval writers accepted such a book as the *Ars Amatoria* are well brought out, but since Ovid was so widely read and did exert a very definite influence directly or indirectly on so many writers, more detailed discussion of his importance would have been welcome. The theory that Ovid is the originator of courtly love is of course untenable, but the person who would fully understand medieval love poetry must surely devote at least a few of his days and nights to the volumes of Ovid. Of almost equal importance is a thorough comprehension of the medieval theory of marriage, a phase of the subject that has been frequently misrepresented in the past. Mr. Lewis summons such figures as Gregory, Hugh of St. Victor, Peter Lombard, Albertus Magnus, and Thomas Aquinas, and points out that, though they all agreed on the sinfulness of the sexual act outside the marriage bond, they varied in their opinions of the act within marriage. To the modern reader one of the most curious features about courtly love is the notion that love cannot exist between husband and wife. This immediately becomes understandable, however, when we read some of these medieval discussions about marriage. If the Church taught or implied that there was a possibility of committing a mortal sin even when the sacrament of matrimony had sanctified the marriage tie, how could the poets well do other than proclaim the impossibility of love's existing between married couples! One might add, however, that it is not always necessary to seek involved explanations to account for adultery.

Chrétien de Troyes and Andreas Capellanus are the true luminaries of courtly theory and practice in northern France, the former as artist, the latter as analyst. Produced at practically the same time¹ and called forth by almost identical social and literary conditions, Andreas's pseudo-philosophical handbook, *De Arte Honeste Amandi*—the title *De Amore* is preferable—is an excellent commentary on Chrétien and a splendid presentation of the whole theory of courtly love. Its practical application is seen at its best in Chrétien's poems. The *Erec*, the *Lancelot*, and the *Yvain* demonstrate clearly the author's development as a courtly love poet: the first violates many of the provisions of the code; the second is justly considered the epic of courtly love; the third transcends it. Much has been written of the Ovidian quality of Chrétien's work, and practically all critics admit the influence of Provençal ideas and ideals. But precisely what did Chrétien owe to Ovid? What did he learn from the poets of Provence? What did he contribute

¹ P. 32: "probably written early in the thirteenth century"; but cf. A. Steiner, *Speculum*, IV, 92 ff., who places the book between 1174 and 1186.

of his own that is significant and individual? No one is better equipped to answer such questions than Mr. Lewis, and it is to be regretted that he did not find it possible to take up these matters in more than incidental fashion. Since both directly and indirectly the Provençal conception of love influenced most of the amatory literature of succeeding centuries in western Europe, I cannot help but feel that Mr. Lewis's exposition of courtly love would have been much richer if he had allowed at least a few of the troubadours to speak for themselves, especially in view of the fact that his translations into Middle English verse are most happy. So too would a general discussion of the *Dolce Stil Nuovo* have been most informative (both of which omissions, I might add, I hope to remedy at least partially in my forthcoming study of courtly love and Chaucer's *Troilus*). Though the plan of the book doubtless precluded such analyses, the story of courtly love would have been fuller and more valuable had they been included.

Many of the readers of this book will be particularly interested in the author's studies of Chaucer and Spenser. Though I shall not discuss the two chapters on allegory and the *Roman de la Rose*, I do not mean thereby to give the impression that they are unimportant, on the contrary, though they cover familiar ground, the approach is both fresh and invigorating, and both chapters are essential if the reader is to understand fully the particular point of view from which Mr. Lewis approaches Chaucer and the later poets. Paradoxically enough, some of the best criticism in the book is devoted to the one work which has least to do with the allegorical form, Chaucer's *Troilus*. Yet the study of the love allegory would have been incomplete had this poem been omitted, for, as Mr. Lewis puts it (p. 178), "Allegory has taught him [Chaucer] how to dispense with allegory, and the time is now ripe for the great love-story which the Middle Ages have so long been in labour to produce." Two elements in the poem are of prime importance, Criseyde's love for Troilus and her subsequent betrayal of him. According to the ethical standards of her own time (not ancient Troy but Chaucerian England), Criseyde's yielding to Troilus was no unforgivable sin and, in so far as the courtly code was concerned, her behavior was quite proper. Her betrayal, however, is a very different matter. By abandoning Troilus for Diomedes Criseyde violated the courtly code in most flagrant fashion; it was truly a sin beyond remission, and this statement also holds when the act is judged by Christian standards: an ardent apologist could make out a case for Criseyde's yielding to Troilus, but nothing can be said for her sudden surrender to Diomedes. What is the explanation for all this? Mr. Lewis gives the answer in one word, Fear: "fear of loneliness, of old age, of death, of love, and of hostility; of everything, indeed, that can be feared" (p. 185). That is the tragic flaw which brings about the ultimate tragedy. Many Chaucerian critics have been both

unkind and unfair to Criseyde. However, I wonder if Mr. Lewis does not tend to err in the opposite direction—not err precisely, for he is essentially correct, but my point is that, since Criseyde is really a very complex character, we should be extremely careful before we attempt to explain her many-sidedness by reference to any one quality. Fear is certainly an important, perhaps the most important, element in Criseyde's mental make-up, but it is not the only thing

The fusion of the erotic and homiletic types of allegory in the century following Chaucer prepared the way for the *Faerie Queene*. Though the poem is of course a truer descendant of the Italian romantic epic than it is of English allegory, Mr. Lewis very properly devotes his final chapter to it, not only on account of its being a "continued allegory, or dark conceit," but also, and particularly, because of the fact that it presents the last phase in his story of courtly love, "the final defeat of courtly love by the romantic conception of marriage." Not many readers will be misled by the publisher's blurb to the effect that the author's approach enables him to restore Spenser's great poem to a position it has not held since Milton's time. The late Professor Greenlaw and several other scholars have vindicated the correctness of Milton's description of Spenser as a better teacher than Aquinas. But what Mr. Lewis does accomplish—and he does it admirably—is to show that allegory is not a puzzle and is not something to read like a detective story; this is the merit not only of the final chapter but of the entire book, namely, that it enables us to understand the *Roman de la Rose*, the *Faerie Queene*, and innumerable other allegorical poems as their authors intended them to be understood.

In this review I fear I have fallen into the easy error of stressing those things which happen to interest me particularly and of letting the others go unmentioned or barely referred to. Nevertheless, I hope I have succeeded in indicating some of the wealth contained in this stimulating volume. The tremendous amount of information, the brilliance of the ideas, the felicitous phrasing and always delightful style, all combine to make *The Allegory of Love* a really outstanding contribution to medieval studies.

THOMAS A. KIRBY

Louisiana State University

The Great Chain of Being. A Study of the History of an Idea. The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University, 1933. By ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936. Pp. ix + 382.

Ideas exist only as entertained by the human mind, and the

study of ideas is only an episode in the study of man. But a study of ideas conducted along this line would leave very much to be desired. Ideas behave as though they had a life of their own with an instinct of self-preservation. They appear on and disappear from the human scene somewhat like Platonic souls which get themselves bodies and then take leave of them, only to return in another transmigration. Men are galvanized by ideas and act as vehicles for them; the ideas themselves seem to behave like causes, determining the trend of human thought while themselves being determined by the human mind.

Such a ruling idea is that of the great chain of being. Prof. Lovejoy's study records the birth, the growth, the vicissitudes, transformations, and finally the senility, and perhaps the death of this idea. The study is as fascinating as that of the rise and decay of an empire, and, in fact, it is the study of the empire of an idea over human minds throughout many centuries. Usually, intellectual histories are histories of systems, such as materialism, idealism, etc.; but systems are too vague and general to exert force upon the human mind throughout a long period of time. Prof. Lovejoy's approach is fresh and different, in that it deals with a doctrine which is comprehensive enough to be important, but sufficiently specific to seize the imagination of human minds. But what is the idea of the Great Chain of Being? Briefly, it is the conception of perfection as plenitude, including all degrees of value from the greatest to the least. Grant, now, that the universe conforms to perfection, and we have the picture of the universe as filling up all the points in the plenum of perfection. The universe is a hierarchical structure, with its parts arranged according to rank, and constructed according to the law of continuity, in the sense that there is a continuous transition from the higher to the lower ranks. Thus the universe forms a chain.

Human thought is activated on the one side by the discovery of facts, and on the other by imaginative patterns by which it interprets these facts. The doctrine of the chain is just such an imaginative pattern,—a schema of rationality by which a vast region of data is illuminated, and new regions of data are led to. It was born in Plato's mind. Prof. Lovejoy makes the point, not always considered by scholars, that Plato had not only an other-worldly tendency, but also a 'this-worldliness.' The Good is not only a principle of abstraction for the world of flux, but one of creativity. In the *Timaeus*, God is said to create the world out of his overflowing goodness, untinged by jealousy. And since the Good is plenitude, in creation, all possibilities and all degrees of perfection are realized. How this idea grew beyond anything that, so far as we know, was in Plato's mind, how in its growth it underwent transformations seemingly incompatible with its original impulse, how, in its very conception, it involved a contradiction, and how, in its development, the contradictory elements split apart

Goethes Faust. Herausgegeben von GEORG WITKOWSKI, Professor an der Universität Leipzig 1. R. Neunte vielfach verbesserte Auflage (51.-53. Tausend). Erster Band: *Erster und zweiter Teil, Urfaust, Fragment, Helena, Nachlaß.* Zweiter Band *Kommentar und Erläuterungen; Literatur, Bilderrhang, Faustwörterbuch.* Leiden: E. I. Brill, 1936. viii + 591 pp., i + 590 pp.

Sources of the Faust Tradition from Simon Magus to Lessing. By P. M. PALMER and R. P. MORE. New York: Oxford University Press, 1936. vii + 300 pp. \$3.50.

Jahrbuch des Freien Deutschen Hochstifts Frankfurt am Main, 1934/35. Herausgegeben von ERNST BEUTLER Halle a. S.: Max Niemeyer.

Goethe-Kalender auf das Jahr 1937 Herausgegeben vom Frankfurter Goethe Museum. Leipzig: Dieterichsche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 248 pp.

Daß Witkowskis Faustausgabe, die seit 1906 dreißig Jahre lang einem halben Hunderttausend von Adepten der treueste und zuverlässigste Führer durch Goethes Hauptwerk gewesen ist, hat ins Ausland abwandern müssen, ist ein Geschehnis, wie es der Verwigung in der Blocksbergscene recht nahe beim Proktophantasmisten wert gewesen wäre. Doch selbst das Gelächter der Groteske befreit nicht angesichts der Tragweite solcher Begebenheiten. Eine Lebensarbeit des Forschers steckt in dem zweiten Bande: Bewältigung von Stoff, Wissen, Scharfsinn, Entscheidung und Einfühlen in den umfassenden und dennoch knappen Einleitungen; Urteil, Auslese in der Pragnanz der zahllosen Anmerkungen und Erklärungen, Beherrschung der Welt Goethes und Bescheidenheit im Dienste ihrer Erklärung. Dies Alles, das wir als Studenten zuerst, dann als Lehrer mit unsern eignen Schülern geschätzt, durchdacht und durchprüft haben, ist als volkisch unzuverlässig ausgewiesen, ohne daß auch nur ein Fachmann hatte die Stimme erheben dürfen!

Wir müssen dem holländischen Verleger dankbar sein für die Aufnahme dieses Werkes und für das würdige Gewand, in dem er es in die Welt hinausschickt. Der Kommentarband ist leichter lesbar geworden durch eine größere Type und den Sperrdruck der Schlagworte. Klar und behutsam eingefügte Zusätze bringen Einleitung sowie Anmerkungen auf den neusten Stand der Forschung, bald in ganzen Absätzen, bald in solch gedrungenen Formulierungen wie:

. . . und so handelt es sich hier nicht um eine "Wette" im eigentlichen Sinne des Wortes, denn bei einer solchen muß der Ausgang beiden Wettenden ungewiß sein. (99)

oder

Das selige Beisammensein mit Helena konnte der titanischen Natur Fausts nur Episode sein, der errungene ästhetische Zustand nicht dauern. Er scheidet aus Helenas Welt gelautert, aber auch hier nicht beruhigt, nicht gewillt, dem Augenblick ein "Verweile doch!" zuzurufen. Für den kontemplativen Menschen bedeutet die Seelenschönheit ein Ziel, dem Tatmenschen von Fausts Art nur ein Mittel, im Wünschen und Vollbringen das Alltägliche, Gemeine zu überfliegen. (109/110)

In der Bibliographie, die einer Anregung Burdachs folgend vor den Bilderanhang gesetzt wurde und nun viel leichter zu finden ist, wurde Veraltetes ausgeschieden, Neues zugesetzt. Die Illustrationen sind durch sieben neue Goethezeichnungen erweitert sowie durch den Tausch einiger Tafeln mit solchen Bildern die Goethe vorgelegen haben mögen. Die Wiedergabe ist klarer geworden, allerdings ist durch Reproduktion des Negativs der Thessalischen Zauberinnen den beiden Figuren Schwert und Stab in die linke Hand geraten. Ganz neu ist das Faustwörterbuch, das seinen Namen nicht ganz mit Recht trägt, da es ein Generalindex ist, der alle Personenbezeichnungen, geographischen Namen, Glossar, Szenenüberschriften, Anfangsworte der Nachlaßstücke, und kommentierten Stellen bucht, nicht aber etwa ein allgemeines Vokabular darstellt. Sein Wert ist unbestreitbar. Hervorzuheben ist noch die Tatsache, daß drei neue Emendationen gelungen sind, darunter vor allem Vers 12109 "Ist es getan."

Der greise Forscher, der im September sein funfundsiebenzigstes Lebensjahr begonnen hat, darf unseres innigsten Dankes versichert sein.

Die Faustsammlung von Palmer und More enthält in guten Übersetzungen die einschlägigen Erzählungen der Simon Magus- und Theophiluslegenden, Original und Übersetzung der Dokumente über den historischen Faust, das englische Faustbuch von 1592, das Ulmer Puppenspiel im Original und die Lessingschen Fragmente. Mit kurzen aber ausreichenden orientierenden Einleitungen und Beigaben über Aufführungen versehen, bedeutet dies Quellenbuch dem amerikanischen Studenten eine willkommene Erweiterung des zum Teil nicht leicht zugänglichen Materials, das in bloßer Inhaltsangabe sonst nur schattenhaft bliebe.

Der stattliche Doppelband des Jahrbuches des Deutschen Freien Hochstifts erweist die bewährte Organisationsgabe seines Herausgebers. Ein Aufsatz Julius Richters über "Jakob Böhme und Goethe" geht nach einer geschickten Zusammenfassung des Böhmischen Gedankenkreises in den Parallelen aus Goethe, Herder, Schleiermacher und Novalis kaum sehr in die Tiefe. Obschon der Verfasser keine Abhängigkeit sondern nur Strukturähnlichkeit aufzeigen will, streift er—trotz der etwas überraschenden Schlußworte über Gleichberechtigung logo- und biozentrischer Anschauungsweise—gefährlich an die Lehre von arischer Denkart, und man hat bei den scheinbaren Parallelen zwischen Goethe und Böhme den

Eindruck: wenn zwei das Gleiche tun, so ist es nicht das Gleiche, da zwischen ihnen die Aufklärung liegt, der Goethe trotz Trennendem tief verpflichtet ist.

Paul Bockmann, seine Untersuchung über den Witz als organischen Ausdruck der Aufklärung fortführend, sucht in seinem gedankenreichen Aufsatz die Einheit der ganzen Romantik in der Eroberung einer neuen Formenwelt zu erweisen. Friedrich Schlegel im Ringen um einen Halt im Leben entdeckt als Ausdruck des unverlierbaren und ursprünglichen Selbstgefühls die Form des Fragments. Tieck erobert die Stimmungswelt als Ausdruck der innern Einheit von Gefühl und Wirklichkeit und erhebt sie zum Totalbereich des Lebens. Brentano wird das geistesbewußte Spiel mit der Phantasie zum Glauben an die poetische Existenz, die von der innern Verbundenheit alles Lebens zeugt. "Gesprengt wird diese Welt erst, als man ihrem Wirklichkeitsverhältnis mißtraut und dem Alltag mehr Recht gibt als dem inneren Zusammenhang von Geist und Leben."—Max Kommerell findet, daß Schillers Seelenkunde, durch Selbstbeobachtung gewonnen, Charakter als aus Tat entstehend und aus Freiheit des Entschlusses gewonnen annimmt, sowie der Dichter sich selbst befohlen habe "so oder so zu sein—unter selbstverhangter Gewalt in despotischer Entzweiung lebend." Diese Anschauung, die aus Schillers Stellung zu Goethe und Kant abgeleitet ist, wird mit fruchtbarem Resultat durch seine asthetischen Aufsätze und Dramen verfolgt und dringt in den Fragmenten zu neuer Erkenntnis vor, so daß der Vorwurf ungenügender Beachtung von Schillers Psychologie berechtigt erscheint.

Karl Simon erweist, welche Bedeutung die bildende Kunst nicht nur als stete Anregung und Kraftquelle für Wilhelm von Humboldt gehabt, wie aktiv er sich durch Reise und Schau, ja endlich in Verbindung mit amtlicher Tätigkeit mit ihr beschäftigt hat, und "wie wenig die noch immer hier und da anzutreffende Anschauung berechtigt ist, daß die deutsche Klassik sich in rein ästhetischem Raume, lebensfern und wirklichkeitsfremd bewege."—In Richard Alewyn findet Hofmannsthalsche Kunst der Komödie einen verständnisvollen Interpreten und Neuwerter, wenn vielleicht auch das Wien der Jahrhundertwende im erklärlichen Gegensatze zu unserer Zeit ein wenig zu rosig gesehen ist.—Joachim Müller verfolgt in behutsamer und scharfsinniger Scheidung den religiösen Weg Rilkes vom tastenden Impressionismus über Abwendung von der Welt im "Monchischen Leben," Abwendung vom Sakulum bis zur Seinsbejahung, der gestaltenden Frömmigkeit. Er verwirft in der Auseinandersetzung mit andern Kritikern die Bezeichnung Mystik für Rilkes religiöses Empfinden.—Beutler endlich veröffentlicht Briefe aus dem Brentanokreise, die z. T. von Steig herausgegeben sind, aber erst in ihrer Vollständigkeit ein richtiges Bild der Korrespondenten, ihrer Art und Stimmung ergeben. Der Band bietet so eine reiche Ausbeute auf hohem wissenschaftlichem Niveau.

Wenn die Wissenschaft im Goethekalender gefälliger und ohne

schweres Rustzeug dahergeht, so bedeutet diese Allgemeinverständlichkeit indessen nicht ein Ausschalten kritisch-sichtender Haltung, außer etwa in der Rede des Bürgermeisters, dessen Hitlerzitat, daß "die Kunst . . . eine zum Fanatismus verpflichtende Mission sei" sowohl von der innigen und so gänzlich unfanatischen Kunst Kolbes wie von dem Suchergeist der Aufsätze widerlegt wird.

Beutler klärt den Sinn des zweiten Teils von Goethes Faust durch Hinweis auf Fausts Lösung von Mephisto, unterschätzt aber doch wohl die Teufelstat in der Philemon und Baucisscene, in der er die Worte der Alten zu sehr für bare Munze nimmt. Zu guter Formulierung gelangt er mit den Worten: "Faust schwor Gott mit dem Munde ab, aber nicht mit dem Herzen—und er tut es gegen sein besseres Selbst."

Neben Aufsätzen über W. von Humboldts Verhältnis zu Goethe, Bettina in München und Landshut, Jung Stilling ist besonders hervorzuheben Max Kommerells schöner Beitrag über Goethes indische Balladen und Hermann Burgers über Schillers Plane zu einem Epos über Friedrich den Großen, der am Kontrast mit Wallenstein aufzuzeigen sucht, was aus diesem Stoff unter Schillers Feder hatte werden können. Indessen dürfte die Frage berechtigt sein, ob dem Dichter damals die Gestalt des Königs nicht noch zu lebensnahe gestanden hatte.

Willkommene Gaben sind die Silhouetten aus dem Goethekreise mit ihren treffenden Charakterisierungen von Josephine Rumpf-Fleck.

ERNST FEISE

Social Conflicts in Medieval German Poetry. By ERWIN GUSTAV GUDDE. Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press, 1934. Pp. viii + 140. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, xviii, no. 1.)

In this treatise Professor Gudde gives us a picture of the social conflicts in Germany as reflected in the poetry of the period extending from the middle of the twelfth to the end of the fifteenth century. Hence he is concerned chiefly with the polemic, critical and didactic writing of the period under investigation. The author is correct in assuming that his work will be interesting to the historian as well as to the philologist. The sociologist and economist, too, will find many striking parallels with present day conditions, as, for example, the quotation from the *Klage* (Gudde, p. 23): "I grieve that the times are not getting better in spite of all that the soil produces."

The material is presented in chronological order. After an introductory discussion of "The Classes in Medieval Germany" (Chapter I) and "The Beginnings of Social Criticism" (Chapter

II), the author treats in Chapters III-XII: "Didactic Poetry at the Beginning of the Thirteenth Century"; "The Apothegmatists after Walther von der Vogelweide"; "Moralists and Satirists between 1250 and 1300"; "A Preacher of Social Harmony" (Hugo von Trimberg); "The Influence of Mysticism"; "Meistersinger in the Fourteenth Century"; "Muskatblut, Beheim, Rosenblut"; "From *The Devil's Net* to *The Ship of Fools*"; "Social Questions and the Volkshied" and "Class Conflicts in Popular Poetry of the Fifteenth Century."

A Bibliography follows, booking: (A) a complete list of the works upon which the investigation was based, (B) a selected number of books and articles which treat of the subject discussed. The Index would benefit by a revision. As a register of matters it is incomplete and occasionally names of the authors treated are omitted.

With a few exceptions the Middle High German citations are translated into English, on the whole very acceptably. In leaving his Latin quotations untranslated the author pays an undeserved compliment to his American colleagues who are surely no more at home in Latin than in Middle High German. In several instances the reviewer does not agree with the author's interpretation (p. 55, note 151; p. 32, note 87). In one passage Professor Gudde's translation is not in accordance with his own punctuation of the Middle High German text (p. 59, note 163). On p. 56 it is surely a peacock and not a pheasant with whose plumes the crow adorns itself. On p. 65, note 190, *si* of the Middle High German text refers not to *it* (the world) but to *they* (the priests). The following errors and misprints were noted: p. 7, note 10 *Eickert* for *Eicken*, p. 14, l. 4 *sol* for *so*; p. 25, *Henry IV* for *Henry VI*; note 69 for 60; p. 26, l. 2 *Sussking* for *Susskunt*, p. 43 *duot* for *quot*, p. 70, *kot* for *kont*. Such trifling errors were to be expected in a work which cites so many passages from such diverse sources and do not militate in the least against the value of Professor Gudde's depiction of the attitude of Middle High German poets and writers toward social and political questions.

In reading this treatise one is struck again and again by the similarity, *mutatis mutandis*, of social conditions in the medieval world with those of today. The views of the writers who file across the pages of Professor Gudde's work are repeated, unwittingly to be sure, by the leaders of the present day political movements in America and Germany. Even the present racial issues are foreshadowed in the poems treated here and "Share the Wealth" sentiments seem to have been as popular then as now. A final chapter giving a careful analysis and a further interpretation of the author's findings would have been welcome in this interesting study.

PAUL R. POPE

Cornell University

- Shakespeare-Jahrbuch.* Herausgegeben im Auftrage der deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft von WOLFGANG KELLER und HANS HECHT. Band 71. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz, 1935. Pp. 237.
- Der Sinn des Hamlet.* Kunstwerk, Handlung, Ueberlieferung. Von LEVIN L. SCHUCKING. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1935. Pp. viii + 132.
- Hamlet the Man.* By ELMER EDGAR STOLL. The English Association, Pamphlet No. 91, March, 1935. New York: Oxford University Press, 1935. Pp. 29.
- Shakespeares Caesarbild.* Von LORENZ MORSBACH. Studien zur englischen Philologie, LXXVIII. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1935. Pp. 32.
- Shakespeares Sonette in Deutschland.* Von LUDWIG W. KAHN. Bern und Leipzig: Gotthelf Verlag, 1935. Pp. 122.
- Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us.* By CAROLINE F. E. SPURGEON. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1935. Pp. xvi + 408.
- The Janus of Poets, Being an Essay on the Dramatic Value of Shakspeare's Poetry Both Good and Bad.* By RICHARD DAVID. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1935. Pp. xii + 164.
- Das Schauspiel der Englschen Komödianten in Deutschland. Seine dramatische Form und Seine Entwicklung.* Von ANNA BAESECKE. Halle: Max Niemayer, 1935. Pp. xiii + 154.
- Production and Stage-Management at the Blackfriars Theatre.* By J. ISAACS The Shakespeare Association. London: Oxford University Press, 1933. Pp. 28.
- The Theme of Revenge in Elizabethan Tragedy.* By PERCY SIMPSON. Annual Shakespeare Lecture of the British Academy, 1935. London. H. Milford, 1935. Pp. 38.
- Reformation und Spanische Andachtsliteratur. Luis de Granada in England.* Von MARIA HAGEDORN. Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten, Band 21. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz, 1934. Pp. 165.
- Zur Verfasserfrage des dekkerschen Stuckes "The Pleasant Comedy of Old Fortunatus."* Von HEINZ THIEME. Borna-Leipzig: Robert Noske, 1934. Pp. x + 57.

Contemporary scholars delving into problems of Elizabethan literature continue to be drawn chiefly to the study of Shakespeare's works, their art, their meaning, and their stage production. Minor

writers of the period interest the investigator primarily for their possible relation to Shakespeare or for the light that they may shed on his lines. True the persons of Marlowe and Kyd are limned more sharply now than they were a decade ago. Peele's life and his genuine writings are better known. Confusions over Lodge and his forebears are dissipating under scrutiny. But Shakespeare problems still comprise the major subjects of study, for three centuries of comment have not killed the urge to discover new paths of approach to his best known plays. Age cannot wither nor custom stale his infinite variety.

This unflinching quest for fresh interpretation is exemplified in the seventy-first *Jahrbuch* of the Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, fittingly dedicated with accompanying portrait to Alois Brandl of Berlin. Brandl's eighty years have been given in generous measure to investigation of the origins of Shakespeare's plots. Yet neither in the longer articles nor in the books reviewed in this number do *Quellenforschungen* play any considerable part. Instead, the writers attack questions of style, text, staging, interpretation of specific plays or characters, influence on later poets. No particularly significant book devoted to any of the minor Elizabethans appeared during the year covered. For the German scholar, if not for the theatergoer, who seems partial to *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, the most popular play continues to be *Hamlet*.

Aside from Dover Wilson's studies of this play the most important recent commentary on it is *Der Sinn des Hamlet*, by the distinguished critic Levin L. Schucking. The author avows his aim to set forth the art of Shakespeare in this greatest one of his works by giving the reader a running explanation of the text. First Schucking discusses the play as a whole, its place in Shakespeare's development as an artist, its characterization, style, and structure. Then he analyzes the action scene by scene. A final chapter of ten pages touches briefly on sources and text.

The stress on scene analysis suggests at once comparison with Wilson's *What Happens in Hamlet* and with J. Q. Adams's edition of this play published a decade ago. Schucking's entire conception of the tragedy and his attitude to each of the characters are remote from those of the other two. Wilson, for example, is at pains to set forth motivation for each single happening in the play. But Schucking finds the structure weak, much of the action unreal, and certain characters, notably the hero, abnormal. Adams blames Gertrude and Ophelia for Hamlet's melancholy. Schucking consistently defends both women, absolving Gertrude of adultery and Ophelia of all weakness beyond devotion to father and brother. Hamlet, he seems to think, has never really loved Ophelia and is to be censured for cruelty to mother and asserted sweetheart. Furthermore, Hamlet can have no justification for sending his two schoolfellows to their death. In Rosencrantz, Guildenstern, Laertes, Polonius, and even Claudius he finds much to admire. When all

this is admitted, one is left wondering what has become of Shakespeare's art.

Elmer Edgar Stoll, once denominated *l'enfant terrible* of American Shakespeareans, differs sharply with Schucking in appraisal of *Hamlet the Man*. To Stoll Hamlet is not a physical weakling, as Schucking thinks, or a psychological study, as implied by Bradley. His evident popularity among Shakespeare's heroes rises in part from his pathetic story but more from his personal charm. Hamlet plays two rôles, those of revenger and malcontent, both types to be found separately in many Elizabethan dramas. The Prince is blameless in thought except for his vindictiveness against his step-father and his indignant rage against his mother. On three occasions his excitement is extravagant. just after his first interview with the Ghost, then after Claudius has unkenneled his guilt on seeing "The Murder of Gonzago," and finally at the burial of Ophelia. On the first two of these occasions Hamlet's conduct is natural. At Ophelia's grave his behavior is so incongruous with his character as exhibited elsewhere that it can be explained only as a situation inherited from the older play. In this brief monograph Stoll more than once apparently answers Schucking's strictures in accounting for the action of the tragedy more rationally and more sympathetically. One wishes that the topic had permitted discussion of minor characters.

Lorenz Morsbach of Gottingen argues that Shakespeare's representation of Julius Caesar is often misunderstood, either because his language is misinterpreted or because Plutarch's conception is substituted for Shakespeare's. Plutarch, a biographer rather than a historian, held strong prejudice against Caesar, but Shakespeare deliberately changed what he read in North's Plutarch. The play, Morsbach thinks, is no Brutus drama though often so interpreted. Caesar's complete fearlessness Shakespeare stresses both in the scene of his departure to the senate-house and in that of his assassination. Later it is the Ghost of Caesar who revenges his death and punishes his enemies. Citations from other Shakespeare plays are adduced to indicate the bard's sincere admiration for Caesar and his lack of the common contemporary bias. The brief monograph is a model of clear writing and freshness of style, but the arguments for Caesar's greatness in the early scenes of the tragedy fail to carry conviction.

Still another investigation of one work of Shakespeare is by Ludwig W. Kahn, whose account of *Shakespeares Sonette in Deutschland* covers a good deal more ground than the title might convey. Kahn shows that German interest in the *Sonnets* lagged many years behind that in the dramas of Shakespeare partly because of the difficulty of translating any English sonnets into German. This, he explains, is inherent in the essential structure of the sonnet and the differences between the two languages. The tendency of the English to employ phrases where the Germans use

compound words, and the fixed word order of the English sentence make impossible a literal translation of the pentameter line. When adequate translations of these poems finally appeared, the phrasing, even the images, varied largely from the original. Translators since then have developed marked individual differences. Early romanticists in consonance with their age exhibited freedom of phrasing in strong contrast with the unadorned speech of Bodenstein, Jordan, and Fulda, representatives of democracy. Stefan George exemplifies in his version the opposing aristocrat. Aside from its historical value, this investigation sheds light on the technique of sonnets and of all translated verse.

An even more significant study of poetic technique is Caroline F. E. Spurgeon's analysis of *Shakespeare's Imagery*, a book that treats of all the plays and all the poems. For ten years Miss Spurgeon has been classifying every image that she could discover in Shakespeare. Now she discusses the significance of these figures of speech in revealing the poet's habits, tastes, opinions, and in forming the background and undertone of his art. The author here does not enumerate all the images recorded, but giving tables to indicate the extent of her classifications, she also quotes several hundred lines. The analysis is clear and is documented with singular accuracy so far as checked. Miss Spurgeon has likewise analyzed images in Bacon, Marlowe, Jonson, Dekker, Chapman, and Marston for comparison. Her conclusion is that Shakespeare was personally "a compactly well-built man, probably on the slight side, . . . lithe and nimble of body, quick and accurate of eye, delighting in swift muscular movement." His hearing and taste were especially acute. He was healthy in body and mind, a countryman all his life, fond of hunting, of horses, and of dogs other than house dogs. Prizing unselfish love he thought fear the greatest of evils. Though Christlike in character he drew no support from conventional religion and had no faith in a future life. In later chapters the author traces certain dominant images in comedies, histories, tragedies, and romances.

Dr Spurgeon has worked with boldness, yet with extreme care. No one will deny the usefulness potentially of a new method of approach, nor will one seriously question her statement as to the topics that interested Shakespeare the man. Yet many will doubt the validity of her final judgments. The dramatist's sensitiveness to sight, sound, and smell, with his keen interest in people and in outdoor life will be granted by all serious students. Inferences as to the color of his skin, the health of his body, particularly his religious beliefs, are not nearly so certain. Much that we are not, we admire in others. So perhaps Shakespeare.

Richard David's *The Janus of Poets* is a smaller, less pretentious volume than Miss Spurgeon's, having for its purpose "to discover exactly what Shakespeare as a dramatic poet was doing, and how he came to do it." David argues that the early plays are literary

rather than dramatic, that the poet was setting down words which he saw written on an ideal page rather than spoken by an ideal actor. The two interests, poetry and drama, as he grew older, became a single instrument. The result is traced chronologically from play to play.

Inasmuch as the five remaining studies have to do with topics of greatly specialized interest, space demands that they be treated in rather summary fashion. Two concern stage history. Dr. Anna Bae-secke's well documented account of the dramas given by the English Comedians in Germany down to 1700 includes two centuries of dramatic development in a form that would please the foreign audience. J. Isaacs of King's College, London, devotes twenty-eight pages to an account of the internal management of the Blackfriars Theatre. Chiefly from stage-directions and inductions to one hundred and fifty plays he deduces conclusions as to producers and their staffs, authors, lighting, music, and prompt-books. In a brief lecture on the revenge theme in Elizabethan tragedy Percy Simpson is at pains to depreciate the general run of Senecan plays that he discusses, but he concludes that to that type of play we are in debt for *Hamlet*. In a far more searching and thorough monograph Dr. Maria Hagedorn digs into practically a virgin field for investigation. Examining Elizabethan books of devotion she finds that the Spanish Luis de Granada influenced not only British recusants but Puritans, and then Donne, Vaughan, and Sir Thomas Browne. Finally, Hanz Thieme's dissertation on the authorship of *Old Fortunatus* attempts to prove that Dekker was revising an earlier comedy of Robert Greene. But Greene's compositions are so much akin to those of Dekker that the internal evidence presented proves nothing.

The really important studies here treated are those of Miss Spurgeon, Schucking, Stoll, and Kahn. Shakespeare's work still provides for Renaissance scholars their most happy hunting ground.

ROBERT ADGER LAW

The University of Texas

Shakespeare and The Audience. A Study in the Technique of Exposition. By ARTHUR COLBY SPRAGUE. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1935. Pp. xii + 327. \$2.50.

In nine chapters, Dr. Sprague discusses Introduction, Time and Place, Some Conventions, The Beginning and the End, Preparation and Surprise, Testimony, The Chorus Character and Others, The Villain and the Hero, Allowance for Motive and Prejudice. In each chapter are about a dozen instances that may be considered to fall under its particular heading. There is little cohesion between

these instances, and practically no progression to the volume; it is a collection of eclectic criticisms on various sometimes rather disconnected points under these headings. The best current names in "criticism" are mentioned, approved, and improved, while the "elders" are gently brought to see the gross error of their ways.

If one asks what Shakspeare Dr. Sprague is discussing—youthful, old, collaborator, reviser, etc.—he finds no direct answer. But in practice Dr. Sprague does not go behind his modern text, being in that respect as much of a "fundamentalist" as Bradley or Chambers. Scholars have long agreed that some sections of such an edition are doubtful. They have now discovered that few surviving texts were acted in full. As Professor Hazelton Spencer has pointed out, this would make a great deal of difference, for instance, in the *Hamlet* a contemporary audience would have seen. Since Dr. Sprague in a footnote merely finds Professor Spencer's findings "interesting," presumably he does not see their fundamental significance for his subject. Nor do we ever hear how some contemporary audiences are known to have reacted with regard to some of the matters discussed. In practice, the audience Dr. Sprague envisions appears to be himself and his critical cronies.

Between Dr. Sprague and these critical cronies there is a great deal of friendly disputing about tastes. Prince Hal has taken his first opportunity to serve notice on whom it may concern that he is not really what he is about to appear to be, a speech which Dr. Sprague assures us "is now pretty generally accepted as a sort of 'choral interlude.'" But, he continues,

If Hal should be taken at his word—if, that is, there was design in his sowing of wild oats—he would be in truth, what Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch is tempted to call him, 'a prig of a rake' Clearly, he is no such monster Shakespeare had been in trouble over Sir John Oldcastle (*alias* Falstaff), and probably was disinclined to run risks. Knowing perfectly well that he was violating dramatic propriety by doing so, he marched his prince down-stage, and made him assure those persons in the audience who might need assurance that he (the future Henry V) intended to reform, when the right moment came, and that the world would admire him all the more because of the contrast with his youthful indiscretions" (p. 295).

Now if Sir Arthur is convinced that Hal is "a prig of a rake," he is entitled to his personal opinion and it may be nobody's business but his. It may be also that Shakspeare has revealed to Dr. Sprague exactly why he took Hal by the ear and paraded him down-stage to make this speech. But at the same time Shakspeare should have explained to Dr. Sprague just how he happened to be in trouble over Oldcastle before he came to write this play. It has been generally supposed that it was this very play—or the second part—which started that trouble.

Perhaps it would help us clear the problem if we knew how Shakspeare's own contemporary audience was supposed to view these sentiments of Hal's. At least, Warwick accepts Hal's view as worthy of high commendation.

The prince but studies his companions
 Like a strange tongue, wherein, to gain the language,
 'Tis needful that the most immodest word
 Be look'd upon and learn'd, which once attain'd,
 Your highness knows, comes to no further use
 But to be known and hated So, like gross terms,
 The prince will in the perfectness of time
 Cast off his followers, and their memory
 Shall as a pattern or a measure live,
 By which his grace must mete the lives of others,
 Turning past evils to advantages

(2 *Henry IV*, iv, 4, 68-78)

As that great scholar "Anonymous" noticed long ago, Warwick is embroidering a sentiment borrowed from Terence—while Shakspeare was not looking, of course. As a matter of fact, this was the chief conventional argument used by the authorities to justify the teaching of all of Terence. Sir Thomas Elyot uses it, for instance, in a well-known passage in *The Governour*. Every learned grammarian was supposed to know it, and hence many others not even that learned would also have known this accepted view. By consequence, they should have accepted Prince Hal's explanation, as proffered by himself and Warwick and later accepted thankfully by the church-men, as apparently by everyone else,—including Falstaff himself, though not thankfully; the moral killed him. All should have taken their cue from Hal's first soliloquy.

That Shakspeare intended them to do so is shown by the fact that Hal uses his first opportunity to set himself right with the audience, and that others at crucial places refresh the memory of the audience upon the point. Clearly, Shakspeare did his best to protect Hal, and as clearly the estimable schoolmasters, critics, and generality who accepted this view of the benefits to be derived from the sowing of wild oats should have found no fault with Hal's explanation. If Hal was a prig, so were most, if not all, of Shakspeare's contemporaries; and neither should have found any fault with the other on this score. Nor is it likely that under the conventions of the time either Shakspeare or his contemporaries would have been conscious of any particular dramatic impropriety on Hal's part in giving the cue.

Of course, our ideas are different, so that we either miss the cue or refuse to believe we have heard aright. We are therefore forced to find a modern equivalent. Dr. Sprague knows the polite solutions, and while there is no disputing about tastes, yet the reviewer suspects that our contemporary, pseudo-historic, eclectic-romantic critics will consider Dr. Sprague's a very pretty one.

T. W. BALDWIN

University of Illinois

William Whitehead—Poeta Laureatus, eine Studie zu den Literarischen Stromungen um die Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts.
 Von AUGUST BITTER. Halle-Saale: 1933. (Studien zur Englischen Philologie, LXXVIII.)

The Works of Thomas Purney. Edited by H. O. WHITE. Oxford: 1933. (The Percy Reprints, No. XII.)

Dr. Bitter's treatise attempts to do in a small way for Whitehead what Professor Draper has done in a large way for William Mason. In fact, the author begins his monograph with a quotation from the earlier volume, and his numerous references suggest his indebtedness to it. The method, as revealed by Dr. Bitter, is simple. One takes a minor figure of the eighteenth century, whose intrinsic merit hardly warrants intensive study, and reveals his historical importance by relating him to the transition period in that century, a period whose literary characteristics soon become so conventionalized that the task of discovering them in the writers of the time offers few difficulties. And in such cases, the neo-classical elements are generally presented with an air of apology and the romantic with the spirit of enthusiasm. The author first gives us a life of Whitehead, based largely on Mason's *Memoir* and the poet's letters found in the *Harcourt Papers*, in which his poems and plays are presented and discussed at the proper places, and in which 1743 is definitely designated as the year marking his transition from the school of Pope to that of Thomson, Gray, and the Wartons. The second chapter reveals the poet as a precursor of romanticism, the third presents him in the capacity of poet laureate, the last discusses the plays (drawn largely from the Greek and the French) in relation to their sources and the dramatic history of the day. While the work lacks the wide erudition and exhaustive treatment of Professor Draper's *Mason*, it is clearly written, intelligent, and fully worthy of the merits of its subject.

The Rev. Thomas Purney, Ordinary and Chaplain of Newgate in the first quarter of the eighteenth century, has left to posterity a small collection of poems, pastoral for the most part, and a score or more prefatory pages of criticism. In both poetry and prose the editor discovers "surprising" qualities, although admitting failure in the poems and suggesting unoriginality in the critical ideas. Purney's poems fail for the same reason that the pastorals of Philips and his followers fail: the impulse to write sprang from a literary theory and not from sympathy with the subject-matter of the poems. Out of the Pope-Philips controversy over the true nature of bucolic poetry arose a theory of the pastoral which found its authority in Theocritus and its manner and method in Spenser. And this theory inspired its adherents to write "true" English pastorals, and its opponents to compose burlesques, which

in the case of Gay, were more successful than the others in representing rural life. Purney's verse, though at times expressing authentic observations of nature, reveals rustic characters whose sentiments and language, to paraphrase Dr. Johnson, are those which the author thinks appropriate to such people rather than being their genuine accents. The result is an artificial simplicity and a synthetic sweetness. Whatever significance lies in Purney's critical ideas, contained in three short prefaces, is found in his revolt against French criticism, his curious idea that rules apply only to dramatic poetry, his condemnation of Longinus for not distinguishing between the sublime of sentiment and that of image, and, what the editor considers his chief contribution to critical thought, his conception of the dramatic use of gloom, which to the reviewer appears not far removed from the Longinian terror found in Dennis, or even perhaps from the terror of Aristotle. The editor recognizes Purney's indebtedness to Dryden, Dennis, and Addison, and certainly no one, not laboring under the fallacious idea of the homogeneity of literary criticism in the age of Pope, would discover anything very remarkable in the poet's critical ideas.

RICHARD F. JONES

Washington University

Leigh Hunt (1784-1859), Contribution à l'histoire du Romantisme anglais. By LOUIS LANDRÉ. PARIS: Société d'Édition "Les Belles-Lettres," 1936. Tome I: L'auteur, pp. 295, Tome II: L'oeuvre, pp. 647. F. 100.

In this book Leigh Hunt's life and works have at last received a brilliant, scholarly, and, in some respects, final treatment. Professor Landré's chief concern is with the works: in his introduction he states his purpose.

Nous voulions essayer d'examiner d'assez près son oeuvre. Une étude des conditions générales dans lesquelles elle avait été produite, puis de ses caractères essentiels devait nous permettre d'en apprécier la valeur. Il n'est peut-être pas inutile d'aider ainsi critiques et lecteurs à séparer le bon grain de l'ivraie dans une oeuvre touffue. De l'étude de certaines productions se dégagent quelques traits caractéristiques d'une époque; or nous croyons qu'il y a beaucoup à apprendre sur l'histoire littéraire de la première moitié du XIX^{me} siècle; à ce titre, notre travail pouvait rendre des services.

He recognizes, however, that such an analysis of the works presupposes a knowledge of the life, especially in considering such a writer as Hunt, whose manner, as well as matter, is largely in the first person; and after weighing the question, he has decided that

the better plan is to isolate the life and present it as a preliminary volume.

In the preparation of that volume he has apparently examined all available sources of information, not merely the obvious ones in England, but those in this country, particularly the practically untouched—and unmatched—collection of Huntiana in the library of the late Luther Brewer (now in the University library at Iowa City). From that search he has gathered many new facts and lightened some dark corners. He has, for instance, discovered that Hunt contributed to the *Edinburgh Review* as early as 1816 (I, 104), and he has at last completely elucidated from documentary evidence the controversy between John and Leigh Hunt over the ownership of the *Examiner* (I, 156-60). But further than that, he has maintained through the examination of thousands of details a sense of design (not to mention a sense of humor), and he has restored to the biography a balance which was destroyed by Hunt's own *Autobiography*. Because of its curious history that work treated Hunt's life after 1830 in the sketchiest possible fashion; later biographers have eschewed to a considerable extent the labor of filling in those missing twenty-nine years. But Professor Landré, undeterred by the research required, has proportioned his work strictly to chronology and the event, and has produced the first really integrated life.

The second volume contains a completely new analysis and criticism of the works. Though the author recognizes that "nous ne trouvons nulle part chez lui [i. e., Hunt] de système, de doctrine définie," he has broken the subject down into an ultra-logical arrangement: first, *Les idées*, divided in turn into *Le réformiste* and *Le critique*; and, second, *L'art*, divided into *Le poète*, *Le dramaturge et le romancier*, and *L'essayiste*. Nor does the process halt there: each subdivision is sub-subdivided with a meticulous and relentless order. Here again is apparent a sense of design, an obvious intellectual control over intractable material. One who has tried, for instance, to comprehend the shifting nebulosities of *The Religion of the Heart* must wholeheartedly admire Professor Landré's achievement in reducing it to a few lucid paragraphs. One must further admire the scholarly conscience which has not shrunk from the examination of the whole of Hunt's almost incredibly voluminous works, even down to the alternative unpublished version of the unacted comedy, *Look to your Morals*, and admire even more the critical temper that has kept its keenness through the ordeal. For Professor Landré has neither lost his patience with the quantity of mediocre stuff through which he has had to wade, nor yet has he allowed enthusiasm for his subject to blind him to the essential mediocrity of most of it.

Appended to the second volume are new and really complete bibliographies, both of Hunt's own works and of collateral ma-

terial, which are at once a measure of the magnitude of the study and a priceless help to any other laborer in the same vineyard. They alone, without the text, would be a notable contribution.

But with all respect to Professor Landré's achievement, he has still not written the book on Hunt that I should like to see written. I question whether the severely intellectual and analytical approach to this subject will yield the most valuable results. Hunt's ideas are most of them not intrinsically worth the minute examination given them; they do not proceed from logical processes, but rather from the interaction of personal experience with a complex of emotional instincts and reflexes. This fact the author recognizes perfectly (see, for example, II, 97, 448), and he attempts some explanation of the psychological factors; but by the very arrangement of his material he has attenuated the connection between life and works to the point of breaking. He, moreover, does not apparently believe that a true understanding involves to some extent a recreation of the character, that the sympathetic intuitions of a Boswell, a Nicolson, or a Lucas give a more truly accurate knowledge than the most logical analysis. The book about Hunt conceived in that spirit is still to be written. But whoever undertakes it will have to acknowledge a very heavy debt to this present one and its author.

G. D. STOUT

*Washington University
Saint Louis*

Studies in the Text of Matthew Arnold's Prose Works. By E. K. BROWN. Paris: Impressions Pierre André [librairie E. Droz], 1935. Pp. iv + 139.

Professor Brown has well served students of Victorian literature by examining the textual changes in all the prose works of Matthew Arnold except his technical studies in education. The end of the book is to show the need for an ultimate critical edition; but meanwhile, this analysis of Arnold's text may be consulted with great profit. Resisting many tempting pedantries, Professor Brown has kept a constant eye for main matters. As a result, his own running comment upon both long, suppressed passages and somewhat slighter alterations is always intelligent and often illuminating.

Arnold revised his work for various reasons: to remove obvious digressions; to make corrections of fact in the light of fresh knowledge; to quench flaming ubiquities; to establish a better temper towards both men and ideas; to attain more of that 'regularity, precision, uniformity, and balance' which was esteemed by a poet who had discovered, 'How hard it is to write prose!'

One regrets, with Professor Brown, however, that some of the cancellations were made. It is 'difficult to applaud the suppression of fervent passages where . . . Arnold discards the toga and writes like a gladiator rather than an elderly senator of criticism.' Such passages, though less deft, were hardly more cruel than much of what Mr. Chesterton has called Arnold's 'enormously insulting politeness.' An Attic smile over one's victim has only an edged urbanity at best. Perhaps the members of our future single-minded society will not understand this silky Victorian method of killing with a caress. When irony has been banished along with sin and poverty, they may prefer a throat resolutely cut in a church to the soft Arnoldian magic of perennially eating one's cake of politeness and having it too. The cancelled passages will at least afford them an occasional view of a critic as unsullied by uncton as are the rest of us.

Professor Brown says that the only existing manuscript of Arnold's prose is that of the discourse on Emerson, in the Widener Library at Harvard. The statement is not quite true. There are manuscripts, privately owned, of a considerable part of *Culture and Anarchy* and all of *The Study of Poetry*. Doubtless there are other manuscripts, though Arnold was adept at clearing his workshop of debris. Professor Brown's suggestion for a critical edition may be, on even other grounds, somewhat premature. But for the moment we have his own admirable book.

HOWARD F. LOWRY

The College of Wooster

La Poésie française contemporaine, 1885-1935, Avec une Bibliographie des poètes, une Bibliographie des ouvrages généraux, une Table analytique des matières et un Index des noms cités. Par HENRY DÉRIEUX. Paris, Mercure de France, 1935; 293 pages.

En Marge de la Mêlée symboliste. Par ERNEST RAYNAUD. Paris, Mercure de France, 1936; 287 pages.

Cinquantenaire du Symbolisme, Exposition de Manuscrits autographes - Estampes - Peintures - Sculptures — Editions rares - Portraits - Objets d'art. Paris, Editions des Bibliothèques Nationales; 254 pages de Catalogue, et 16 planches à la fin du volume.

Avec ces trois ouvrages on se documente assez bien sur les dernières décades du mouvement littéraire et artistique. Il y en a sans doute d'autres, comme *l'Iniation à la Littérature d'Aujourd'hui*, par Émile Bouvier (1932), E. Raynaud, *La Mêlée symboliste* (3 vol.

1918-1923), M. Raymond, *De Baudelaire au Surréalisme* (1933); mais pour considérer cette période avec quelque perspective, et dans son ensemble, ces nouveau-venus sont fort intéressants chacun d'ailleurs à son point de vue.

Celui de Dérieux est comme le titre l'indique un tableau général, —et un tableau des plus judicieux. On suit d'autant mieux l'enchaînement des doctrines successives ou simultanées que l'auteur s'en tient strictement au domaine de la poésie, mais de telle façon qu'il est facile au lecteur tant soit peu au courant des choses d'établir le parallèle dans les autres domaines—du roman, du théâtre, des arts, de la musique, de la peinture et de la sculpture. L'action persistante de V. Hugo est bien mise en relief, avec témoignages des poètes eux-mêmes à l'appui (les Pierre Louys, les Régnier, les Rostand . . .); M. Dérieux nous convainc non moins facilement que, vues à distance, les divergences entre le parnassisme et le symbolisme s'estompent considérablement; l'influence grandissante de Baudelaire—d'ailleurs moins contestée—est soulignée à son tour, celle de Mallarmé, "le musicien du silence," justement estimée, et enfin l'auteur fait bien voir que "débats passionnés, commentaires parfois contradictoires, telle est depuis Maurice Scève la rançon de l'hermétisme" (p. 30).

M. Dérieux sait demeurer extrêmement clair, et éviter les écueils si nombreux dans le labyrinthe de l'époque. Il sait caractériser d'un mot heureux les personnalités: de Moréas, p. ex., il nous dit: "L'innovation de Moréas, ce fut, somme toute, de *décanter* le Romantisme . . ." (p. 69), il définit justement "l'âme ingénue" de Fr. Jammes, et sait, en quelques mots, sauver de l'oubli des noms qui sans être de premier ordre ne sont cependant pas négligeables. Il a une admiration sans borne pour Claudel ("Jamais, je crois bien, dans notre langue, on n'avait assisté à pareil déferlement; jamais, et pas même chez Hugo, on n'avait vu, à tous les branchages, s'alourdir et pendre pareilles grappes," p. 119, cf. p. 207). Il a une admiration à peine moindre pour Valéry qui aurait "réalisé cette synthèse Racine-Mallarmé que l'avant-guerre avait entrevue, mais sans l'atteindre" (p. 166)—en même temps, il met en garde contre le "valérisme," cette "sorte de mécanique destinée à malaxer le langage poétique" et qui est "en voie de constituer un poncif des plus périlleux" chez des imitateurs sans talent (p. 210). Ce qui nous paraît surtout digne d'être relevé, c'est la belle impartialité, la largeur de vue de Dérieux qui sait louer les uns sans chercher à démolir les autres; les Fantaisistes, Cocteau, les Surréalistes—il s'efforce à tout comprendre et fait preuve d'une merveilleuse pénétration pour distinguer le bon grain de l'ivraie (voir ses pages sur le Surréalisme, 193-202). Il termine sur quelques mots au sujet de Patrice de la Tour du Pin, qu'il considère avec d'autres comme le plus prometteur de la génération qui vient—pourvu que les grands éloges qui ont été prodigués ne le perdent pas: "L'épreuve la plus difficile attend ce jeune poète, apparu entre tant d'incertitudes et de

ruines, comme l'espoir d'or de notre poésie" (p. 217-8. Chose curieuse, ce poète est justement un de ceux qui n'est pas indiqué dans la bibliographie si utile de la fin du volume).

Le volume d'Ernest Raynaud nous livre plutôt le côté anecdotique du Symbolisme, le terme anecdotique n'étant pas employé ici dans un sens péjoratif; tout au contraire. Signalons un essai sur la triple évolution de Mallarmé; un autre sur Verlaine, et qui offre, celui-ci, une interprétation assez paradoxale de la pièce célèbre, *L'Art poétique*; selon Raynaud il s'agirait en vérité d'un manifeste *parnassien* et non symboliste du tout, écrit à propos d'une petite querelle entre Verlaine et Charles Morice; peu de temps après son arrivée à Paris, Morice avait dit son enthousiasme pour la nouvelle poésie; et, si nous comprenons bien, Verlaine aurait voulu faire quelque concession par amour de la paix, dans un poème qui resterait fondamentalement anti-symboliste. Il est bien difficile, cependant, d'accepter cette interprétation, d'autant plus que, d'après Martino, généralement fort bien renseigné, le poème aurait été écrit dès 1873 quoique rendu public seulement en 1884. Les meilleures pages du livre de Raynaud, peut-être, sont celles consacrées à Tailhade, l'auteur de *Au Pays du Muffle* et l'une des figures de second rang les plus originales. A peine moins intéressantes sont celles qui évoquent la bizarre figure de Robert de Montesquiou, — moins "étreinté" par Proust comme M. Charles que par Rostand comme le paon de *Chantecler*. On nous montre un Henri de Régner, sceptique à l'endroit du Symbolisme, et on signale chez Valéry la distance qui sépare les deux versions du *Narcisse* — d'avant la crise et d'après la crise du silence. Valéry Larbaud est présenté presque comme un méconnu.

Beaucoup de souvenirs personnels de l'auteur rendent l'ouvrage fort vivant; sans qu'on y cherche autre chose que ce qu'ils valent, ces souvenirs sont bons à retenir; il y en a sur les Hydropathes, les Hirsutes, les Zutistes et autres groupes qui fourmillaient en marge du Symbolisme; et pour qui veut rôder à Paris en quête de réminiscences littéraires, il revivra mieux la période s'il sait que Verlaine rendit fameux le Café François 1^{er}; Moréas, le Vachette (celui-ci d'ailleurs défunt); Paul Fort, la Closerie des Lilas; Vallette, le Buffet Alsacien de la Rue Jacob; Apollinaire, le Café de Flore, etc.

Le *Catalogue de l'Exposition du Cinquantenaire* est fait avec un soin extrême par deux bibliothécaires distingués de la Nationale, MM. André Jaulme et Henri Moncel, avec une Préface d'Edmond Jaloux. Toutes sortes de renseignements y sont consignés qu'on ne trouvera pas facilement ailleurs. L'exposition a, du reste, été conçue en sorte de montrer qu'il s'agit d'évoquer plutôt encore qu'une école littéraire toute une époque dont le Symbolisme n'est en somme qu'une manifestation frappante. Des vitrines entières étaient consacrées aux "maîtres" comme Mallarmé, Verlaine, Rimbaud, Régner; les autres contenaient des objets se rapportant aux éditeurs,

aux cafés, aux artistes et musiciens, aux précurseurs, aux après-venants, aux ésotériques, aux écrivains étrangers.¹

Aux murs, des portraits et des œuvres d'art (plusieurs de ces dernières fort intéressantes, inspirées par Maeterlinck, Mallarmé, Huysmans, etc., de Moreau à Gauguin). L'évocation était saisissante, et le Catalogue reste un des documents les plus précieux de la période, même après que les trésors de l'exposition ont été dispersés pour rentrer dans les collections particulières.

ALBERT SCHINZ

University of Pennsylvania

Bibliografia analitica tassiana (1896-1930); con due appendici e un indice dei nomi. By ALESSANDRO TORTORETO and JOSEPH G. FUCILLA. Milano: Casa editrice Bolaffio, 1935. Pp. xviii + 167. Lire 12.

This is a most welcome volume for students of Tasso, and an extremely useful one. It has grown out of an article published by Professor Tortoreto in the *Annuario del R. Liceo-Ginnasio Melchiorre Gioia* for the year 1929-30 under the title "Oltre un trentennio di studi su Torquato Tasso" and reprinted in 1932 as a thin volume of 56 pages with the same title (Milano: Scuola tip. Artigianelli), and an article by Professor Fucilla, "Contributions to a Tasso Bibliography," *PQ.*, 1933, 170-186. Numerous additions to both articles have been included in the joint work, as well as two appendices supplementing the older bibliographies of Solerti and Ferrazzi. To the *Avvertenza* have been added copious notes citing the more important titles that have appeared since 1930. The whole is a comprehensive bibliography arranged in convenient chapters covering general studies, biographical material, editions of the works, critical studies, translations, Tasso's influence upon Italian and foreign literatures, etc. Cross references and an index increase the usefulness of the volume, which must henceforth have its place among the indispensable tools of Tasso scholars; they are numerous, as the more than seven hundred titles listed here attest.

Two inevitable faults of all bibliographies are, of course, printer's errors and omissions. The former are fairly numerous here, but have for the most part been corrected in the *errata*, the latter can be remedied, in part, only by the willing cooperation of those who chance to come across a missing title. In this spirit I offer the following additions.

¹ On est surpris de ne pas voir là l'ouvrage de R. Taupin, *L'Influence du Symbolisme français sur la poésie américaine 1910-1920*, Paris, 1930

Bray, René, *La Formation de la doctrine classique en France*, Paris, Hachette, 1927, discusses Tasso's influence Cabanès, *Les Indiscrétions de l'histoire*, Paris, A. Michel, 1903, contains chapter on "La folie du Tasse," which had already appeared in *La Revue*, May 15, 1895. Farnelli, A., *Dante e la Francia*, Milano, Hoepli, 1908, frequent references to Tasso, not always exact. Mignon, Maurice, *Les Affinités intellectuelles de l'Italie et de la France*, Paris, Hachette, 1923, pages on Rousseau and Tasso. Noli, R., *Les Romantiques français et l'Italie*, Dijon, Bernigaut et Privat, 1928, p. 122 and *passim*. Picot, Emile, *Les Français italianisants au XVI^e siècle*, Paris, Champion, 1906-07, see index Plate, Rudolf, *Voltaire als Epentheoretiker und Dichter der Henriade*, Danzig, Boemig, 1917. Sainte-Croix, C., *Armide et Gildas, drame*, Paris, Librairie Générale, n. d. (1904), adapted from Tasso. Searles, C., "Italian Influences as seen in the Sentiments of the French Academy on the *Cid*," *RR*, 1912, pp. 362-390. Texte, Joseph, "L'Italie et la critique française au XVIII^e siècle," *RCC*, January 16, 1896, see p. 449. Vianey, J., review of M^{gr}. Grete's *Bertaut* in *RHL*, 1904. Williams, R. C., *The Merveilleux in the Epic*, Paris, Champion, 1925; *passim*. An article in *Marzocco*, July 11, 1926, on "La Collezione di un amatore del Tasso."

To the *Appendix*, add (or correct) P. 124, A. Johanet, Une descente, etc. Paris, 1873, this work is by Henri Johanet, the B. N. has an edition published in Paris, Didier, 1874. The same author has an essay on "Le Tasse Sorrente et Saint Honophre" in *Annales religieuses et littéraires de la ville et du diocèse d'Orléans*, 1866. P. 129, M. Doigni, "Erminie consolée," *Almanach des Muses*, 1788; this was republished in *Œuvres de M. d'Ogny*, Paris, Delaforest, etc., 1826, vol. iv, pp. 216-223, along with a free version of another passage from Tasso entitled "Clorinde expirante," pp. 224-251. P. 130, N. Drake, *Ofr.* a pag. 121, should read pag. 122. P. 131, M. F. Delcroix, *Fragments d'un poème . . .*; this author's initials are F-J-M.; his *Fragment* (sing.) had already appeared in Paris, Janet et Cotelet, 1811, and was republished there by Delaunay in 1823, both times with the title *Hermine*. The latter volume also contains a translation of Tasso's sonnet "Negli anni acerbi tuoi," which had already been printed in the *Almanach des Muses* for 1820; *Hermine* appeared in this periodical in 1824. P. 131, Clément (de Didon); should read Dijon. Clément's first published version of a part of Tasso's poem seems to have appeared anonymously with the title, *Chant XVI de la Jérusalem délivrée, mis en vers par un jeune homme de cette ville*, Dijon, L. Hucherot, 1761. It was made, not from the original, but from a prose translation, according to the publisher's preface, which adds that the *jeune homme* is eighteen years old; Clément was born in 1742. In his later, signed translation this canto is reworked, but not beyond recognition, as many of the earlier verses are kept unchanged. P. 132, M. Alexandre; should read Alexandre Duval. P. 134, Madama Gottis, *Il Tasso*, etc.; this translation from the French is by Alessandro Magni. The following titles should be added. Jacobi, Johann Georg, *Vindiciae Torquati Tassi*, disputatio, quam in Academia Georgica Augusta 27 sept. 1763, publice defendet auctor . . . Goettingae, n. d. Mestscherski, le prince Elim, *Les Roses noires*, Paris, Librairie d'Amvot, 1845; contains "Le Tasse à Ferrare, fragment d'un Poème dramatique," pp. 221-231. Miger, P.-A.-M., *Poésies diverses*, Paris, Perlet, 1793; contains translations of various stanzas of *Ger. lib.* Mirabeau, comte H.-G. de, *Recueil de contes*, Londres, 1780, repub. 1796, contains (II^e Partie, pp. 96-162) "Armide et Renaud," adapted from Tasso. Perrodil, Victor de, *Études épiques et dramatiques*, Paris, B. Cormon et Blanc, 1935; contains translation of canto XVI of the *Gerusalemme liberata*.

CHANDLER B. BEALL

University of Oregon

BRIEF MENTION

Mr. Bulkeley and the Pirate, a Welsh Diarist of the Eighteenth Century. By B. DEW ROBERTS. London [New York]: Oxford University Press, 1936. Pp. viii + 194. \$3.00. Mr. Roberts' diverting biography is based on Squire William Bulkeley's diaries for 1734 to 1743 and 1747 to 1760. It will appeal primarily to the student of eighteenth-century English manners. Among the interesting features are Bulkeley's comments on Ireland in 1735, and his inclusion of quotations from favorite poets. It is unfortunate that more of the actual diary material was not included. Bulkeley's daughter, Mary, married Captain Fortunate Wright, whose piracy was carried on under Letters of Marque.

University of California at Los Angeles

CLAUDE JONES

CORRESPONDENCE

THE LIBRARY OF THE ASSOCIATION CANADO-AMÉRICAINNE. Neglect of linguistic research in New England French, particularly in the last twenty years, has been such that even the principal Franco-American library has remained virtually unknown. This collection, the Bibliothèque Lambert, was established in 1918 at Manchester, N. H., by the Association Canado-Américaine, a leading French national society and vigorous defender of the French language in New England. No catalogue or other description has hitherto made its way into print; an incomplete mimeographed book-list available at the library is in no sense regarded by the A. C.-A. as definitive. It gives me pleasure to thank M. Adolphe Robert, president of the A. C.-A., and M. Adélarde Lambert, for their generous aid in this survey. The greater part of the collection was assembled originally by M. Lambert, a Franco-American now living in Drummondville, P. Q., and formerly a director of the American Folk-Lore Society. This "superbe collection de Canadiana" (G. Lanctot, *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, xxxvi [1923], 208) was, despite slender resources, patiently brought together in unusual circumstances, as intimated in M. Lambert's *Journal d'un bibliophile* (Drummondville, 1927). The A. C.-A. purchased the bulk of the original Lambert collection in 1918. As of August 1936, the library contains some 2250 books, over 1400 pamphlets, and several hundred letters, all of which are with few exceptions related to French Canada and New England. Except for some 350 publications in English and about 250 French books from Europe, the Lambert library consists entirely of French works of North American authorship. The Canadian collection includes about 1700 books and over 1100 pamphlets, while 250-odd New England publications form the remainder of the library. The foregoing figures are kept approximate, since rigorous classification of an

author's provenience is of course often impossible. Also, numerous book-binding eccentricities (antedating accession by the A. C.-A.) would make attempts at greater precision only the more arbitrary.

Of first importance in the New England collection are thirteen beautifully executed MSS. in the hand of Henri d'Arles (abbé Henri Beaudé, 1870-1930). These volumes contain almost the complete work of the one Franco-American writer of appreciable literary merit. M. Robert is about to publish a detailed study of his life and writings. A further MS. (2 vols.) is the original of Edouard Richard's *Acadie*, later edited by Henri d'Arles (Quebec, 1916-21). Other valuable historical material includes nine volumes of newspaper cuttings which relate primarily to New England, and three files of correspondence which would be of interest both to the linguist and to the Franco-American chronicler. The library also contains minutes of the Société Franco-Américaine du Demer de St. Pierre and of the Association Catholique de la Jeunesse Franco-Américaine. While the A. C.-A. has but few New England French newspapers or other periodicals, its collection is nevertheless excelled only by that of the American Antiquarian Society. The file, rarely complete, of *Ocours Français* (ed. Joseph Dumais, Manchester, Dec 1907-Nov 1908) is useful for numerous articles rich in examples of New England speech habits. Complete files also include the Woonsocket *Sentinel* (1924-29) and the Worcester *Travailleur* (1931—), both essential to Franco-American studies; the short-lived *Foyer Canadien* (ed. J.-V. Gélinas, Manchester, March-June, 1908), and the *Echo de Notre-Dame* (Manchester, 1932—). The *Messenger de New-York* (1930—) is likewise complete. Further publications include partial files of the *Bulletin paroissial de Lowell* (1910-19); *Revue anti-alcoolique* (Fall River, 1916-18), *Almanach franco-américain et catholique* (Fitchburg, 1911-13), *Clavon* (Fall River, 1919); nos 1-5 of the Woonsocket *Devoir* (1912), nos 1-8 of the *Parole française* (Manchester, 1920), nos 1-5, 7, 8, 10 of the *Beau Parler* (Boston, 1914); and scattered issues of many more (including the Boston *Ami de l'Orphelin*, the *Sentinel* of South Lancaster, Mass., and the *Dimanche de Lewiston*, Maine; of which none are recorded in M. Tétrault, *Rôle de la presse franco-américaine* [Marseille, 1935]). In addition to Henri d'Arles, New England literary authors represented in the Bibliothèque Lambert include G.-A. Boucher, G. Crépeau, Mme Duval-Thibault, Mlle A.-M. Gastonguay, J.-A. Girouard, E.-J. Janelle, A. Lambert, L.-A. Lévesque, E. Pinguault, Mme C. Rocheleau-Rouleau, J.-H. Roy. The rest of the New England section is largely made up of parish and other local histories, together with Franco-American festival and society pamphlets. The limited extent of the A. C.-A. collection in this field is of course accounted for by the obvious lack of literary productivity in French New England. The Bibliothèque Lambert is, however, not surpassed in books of Franco-Americana.

Literary works in abundance, together with general and local histories, constitute the greatest part of the Canadian section. In addition, the A. C.-A. library, although not represented in the *Union List of Serials* (ULS), contains over 500 volumes of Canadian periodicals plus about

450 separate numbers. These include complete files of the following reviews no longer published: *Abeille* (Quebec, 1848-81; complete in no ULS library), *Ruche littéraire* (Montreal, 1853-59); *Sorées canadiennes* (Quebec, 1861-65), *Foyer canadien* (Quebec, 1863-66), the seldom complete *Revue canadienne* (Montreal, 1864-1922), *Gazette des Familles canadiennes et acadiennes* (Ottawa, 1869-78); *Album de la Minerve* (Montreal, 1872-74); *Annuaire de l'Institut canadien de Québec* (Quebec, 1874-89); *Foyer domestique* (Ottawa, 1876-79; renamed *Album des Familles*, 1880-84, and *Lyre d'Or*, 1888-89; this ten-volume set is not complete in any ULS library); the rare *Revue de Montréal* (1877-81), *Nouvelle France* (Quebec, 1881-82; not complete in any Canadian ULS library), *Nouvelles Sorées canadiennes* (Quebec-Montreal, 1882-88); *Journal du Dimanche* (Montreal, 1883-85); *Étudiant* (Joliette, 1885-92; renamed *Bon Combat*, 1893); *Canada-Français* (Quebec, 1888-91); *Famille* (Joliette, 1891-92); *Opinion publique* (Montreal, 1892-93); *Kermesse* (Quebec, 1892-93); *Coin du Feu* (1893-96); *Voix du Précieux Sang* (St Hyacinthe, 1894-98); *Revue nationale* (Montreal, 1895-97); *Journal de Française* (Montreal, 1902-09); *Bulletin du Parler français au Canada* (Quebec, 1902-18; in 1918 renamed *Canada français*, of which A. C.-A. has complete file to date), *Nouvelle France* (Quebec, 1902-18); *Revue franco-américaine* (Quebec-Montreal, 1908-19; important also for French New England), *Petit Canadien* (Montreal, 1913-18); the rare *Pays laurentien* (Montreal, 1916-18); *Revue acadienne* (Montreal, 1917-18). Nearly complete are the A C.-A. files (dates noted here are as represented in the library) of the *Mémoires de la Société historique de Montréal* (1859-80), *Opinion publique* (Montreal; Jan. 1, 1870-Nov. 15, 1883); *Monde illustré* (Montreal, 1884-1902; renamed *Album universel*, 1902-07), *Feuille d'Érable* (Montreal, 1896); *Oloches de St. Boniface* (St. Boniface, Manitoba, 1902—); *Action nationale* (Montreal, 1933—). The library also possesses 44 volumes of the *Naturaliste Canadien* (1868-1918), the last 7 volumes of the *Echo du Cabinet de Lecture paroissial de Montréal* (1867-73), vols. 1-x of the *Revue populaire* (Montreal, 1907-17), and quantities of scattered issues from many further periodicals. The only complete file from France is that of the *Revue des Deux Frances* (1897-99); listed in only one ULS library. Among the older books (cf. also Lambert, *Journal*, pp. 39, 51-52) in the library are some seventeenth-century editions of French voyage literature, including Talma's copy of Hennepin, *Nouvelle Découverte d'un très grand pays situé dans l'Amérique* (Amsterdam, 1698). The A C.-A. also has copies of somewhat rare French texts of the anti-Catholic diatribes of Pierre de Sales Laterrière and le père Chiniquy.

At Woonsocket (Rhode Island), the Union St.-Jean-Baptiste d'Amérique maintains a library somewhat similar to that of the A. C.-A. The Bibliothèque Lamber is, however, substantially richer in the French Canadian and French New England fields. In this respect it offers excellent resources to the student of French language and tradition in North America.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received]

Annual Bibliography of Eng. lang. and lit., XVI (1935), ed. M. S. Serjeantson and L. N. Broughton. *Cambridge*: U. Press, 1936. Pp. xii + 279. \$2.00.

Anthony, Sister Rose.—The Jeremy Collier Stage Controversy, 1698-1726. Marquette diss., 1937. Pp. xvi + 328. \$2.00

Ardenne, S. T. R. O. d'.—Ed. of *be Lufade aut te Passiun of Sente Iulene*. *Paris*: Droz, 1936. Pp. 1 + 251. (Bibl. de la fac. de phil. et lettres de l'univ. de Liège, lxiv.)

Arneke, H.—Kirchengeschichte und Rechtsgeschichte in England (von der Reformation bis zum frühen 18. Jhr.). *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1937. Pp. vi + 355.

Beaty, J. O.—Swords in the dawn [the story of Hengist and Horsa told as fiction]. *New York*: Longmans, Green, 1937. Pp. xii + 212. \$2.00

Bement, D.—Mod. Eng. writing. *New York*: Farrar and Rinehart, 1937. Pp. x + 294.

Boas, F. S. and Serjeantson, M. S.—The Year's Work in Eng. Studies. xvi. 1935. *London* [and N. Y.]: Oxford U. Press, 1937. Pp. 380. \$3.75.

Botkin, B. A.—The American Play-Party Song with a collection of Oklahoma texts and tunes. U. of Nebraska diss., 1937. Pp. 400

Brady, Caroline A.—The Eormanric of the Widsið. *Berkeley*: U. of Cal. Press, 1937. Pp. 12. (U. of Cal. Pubs. in Eng., III, 6.)

Brandl, Alois.—Vom kosmologischen Denken des heidnisch-christlichen Germanentums. der früh-ags. Schicksalspruch der Hs. Tiberius B. 13 und sie Verwandtheit mit Boethius. *Berlin*: W. de Gruyter, 1937. Pp. 12. RM. 1. (Sitz. der Preuss. Ak., 16.)

Brawne, Fanny.—Letters to Fanny Keats, 1820-4, ed. M. B. Forman. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1937. Pp. xxxii + 103. \$3.00

Brie, Fr.—Die nationale Literatur Schottlands von den Anfängen bis zur Renaissance. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1937. Pp. xiv + 371. RM. 14.

Brown, C. A.—Life of John Keats. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1937. Pp. viii + 129. \$2.50

Conley, C. H.—Patterns of reading and writing. *New York*: Farrar & Rinehart (1937). Pp. xvi + 772.

Curry, W. C.—Shakespeare's philosophical

patterns. *Baton Rouge*: L. S. U. Press, 1937. Pp. xii + 244. \$2.75.

Delatte, F.—Périodiques et collections de philologie anglaise. *Brussels*: 1937. Pp. 24. (Revue belge de phil. et d'hist., xvi.)

Dobbie, E. Van K.—The MSS of Cædmon's Hymn and Bede's Death Song, with a critical text of the Epistola Cuthberti de obitu Bedæ. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1937. Pp. xii + 129. \$2.25.

Dottin, P.—Le théâtre de Somerset Maugham. *Paris*: Perrin, 1937. Pp. 264. Fr. 15.

Ernst, M. S.—Words, Eng. roots and how they grow. *New York*: Knopf, 1937. Pp. x + 112. \$1.20.

Frauchiger, S.—Der englische Modernismus in seinen neuzeitlichen Auswirkungen nach den Werken von Dean Inge. *Zürich*: Niehans (1937). Pp. 120. (Swiss Studies in Eng., 5.)

Golding, L. T.—An Elizabethan Puritan, Arthur Golding, trans. of Ovid and Calvin. *New York*: R. R. Smith, 1937. Pp. x + 276. \$3.50

Hall, Joseph.—The Discovery of a New World, Englished by John Healey, ed. Huntington Brown. Foreword by R. E. Byrd. *Cambridge*: Harvard U. Press, 1937. Pp. xxxvi + 230. \$2.50.

Hawkins, L. F.—The Place of Group F in the Canterbury chronology. N. Y. U. diss., 1937. Pp. vi + 57

Hazen, A. T.—Samuel Johnson's prefaces and dedications. *New Haven*: Yale U. Press, 1937. Pp. xxiv + 257. \$3.00.

Heilman, R. B.—America in Eng. fiction, 1760-1800. *Baton Rouge*: L. S. U. Press, 1937. Pp. x + 480. \$3.00.

Hill, M. G. and Eagleson, H.—Writing from Experience. *New York*: Crofts, 1937. Pp. xiv + 389. \$1.50.

Hoare, D. M.—The Works of Morris and of Yeats in relation to early Saga lit. *Cambridge*: U. Press [N. Y.: Macmillan], 1937. Pp. x + 179. \$2.00.

Howarth, R. G.—Shakespeare's *Tempest*. *Sidney*: Australian English Association, 1936. Pp. 55.

Huntington Library Bulletin, no. 11, April, 1937. *Cambridge*: Harvard U. Press, 1937. Pp. 161.

Jeliffe, R. A.—Types of exposition. *New York*: Farrar & Rinehart (1937). Pp. viii + 490.

Jonson, Ben, ed. C. H. Herford and P. Simpson. v. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [N. Y.: Oxford Press], 1937. Pp. xvi + 554. \$7.00

Letters in Canada, 1936, éd. A. S. P. Woodhouse, repr. from U. of Toronto Quarterly, vi, 3, 4, 1937. Pp. 250.

Neale, Thomas.—The Warde, a Tragicomedy, ed. J. A. Mitchell. U. of Pa. diss., 1937. Pp. 100.

Noack, H.—O Henry als Mystiker. *Berlin*: Junker und Dunnhaupt, 1937. Pp. 100 RM. 1

Noyes, G. R. and Potter, G. R.—Hymns attributed to John Dryden. *Berkeley*: U. of Cal. Press, 1937. Pp. vi + 214. (U. of Cal. Pubs. in Eng., 6)

Oshorn, Louise B.—Life, letters, and writings of John Hoskyns, 1566-1638. *New Haven*: Yale Press, 1937. Pp. viii + 321. \$2.50.

Parker, W. R.—Milton's debt to Greek tragedy in *Samson Agonistes*. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1937. Pp. xvi + 260. \$2.50.

Patrick, D. L.—The Textual History of *Richard III.* *Stanford U.*: Stanford U Press, 1937. Pp. 153 (Stanford U. Pubs., vi, 1.)

Pfander, Homer G.—The Popular Sermon of the Medieval Friar in England. *New York U. diss.*, 1937. Pp. vi + 66.

Pottle, F. A., Foladare, J., Kirby, J. P., and others.—Index to the private papers of James Boswell. *New York*: Oxford Press, 1937. Pp. 259 \$21.00

Richards, E. A.—Hudibras in the burlesque tradition. *New York*: Columbia U Press, 1937. Pp. x + 184 \$2.50.

Rosenthal, Constance L.—The *Vitae Patrum* in old and middle Eng. lit. U. of Pa. diss., 1936. Pp. 172.

Sauter, Edwin.—Dramas and Poems. *New York*: Henry Harrison, 1936. Pp. 194. \$2.50.

Schirmer, W. F.—Geschichte der eng. Lit. 2, 3, 4 Lief. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1937. Pp. 81-400 RM. 2 each.

Schroer, M. M. A. und Jaeger, P. L.—Englisches Handwörterbuch. App.-bla. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1937. Pp. 80. RM. 2.25.

Schücking, L. L.—The Meaning of Hamlet, trans. G. Rawson. *London* [and N. Y.]: Oxford U. Press, 1937. Pp. xii + 195. \$2.25.

Scrope, Stephen.—The Dicts and Sayings of the Philosophers, a M. E. version ed. Margaret E. Schofield. U. of Pa. diss., 1936. Pp. ii + 222.

Straumann, H.—Newspaper Headlines, a study in linguistic method. *London*: Allen & Unwin [N. Y.: Macmillan] (1935). Pp. 263. \$4.00.

Swift, Jonathan.—Poems, ed. Harold Williams. 3 v. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [N. Y.: Oxford U. Press], 1937. Pp. lxii + 1242. \$21.00

Thomas, Russell.—Plays and the theater. *Boston*: Little, Brown, 1937. Pp. viii + 729. \$1.68. [Text of 8 Eng. and Amer. plays and trans. of *Antigone*, *Patelin*, *l'Avare*, and *An Enemy of the People*.]

Thorp, Margaret F.—Charles Kingsley, 1819-75. *Princeton*: Princeton U. Press, 1937. Pp. x + 212

Valentine and Orson, trans. from the French by Henry Watson, ed. Arthur Dickson. *London* [and N. Y.]: Oxford U. Press, 1937. Pp. lxxiv + 375. \$8.00

Webster, John.—Complete Works, ed. F. L. Lucas. 4 v. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1934. Pp. xviii + 288 + 372 + 339 + 274. \$10.50.

Wernitz, Herbert.—Neil Munro und die nationale Kulturbewegung im modernen Schottland. *Berlin*: Junker und Dunnhaupt Verlag, 1937 (Neue Deutsche Forschungen, Abt. Englische Philologie, 10)

Withington, Robert.—Excursions in English Drama. *New York* [and *London*]: D. Appleton-Century, 1937. Pp. x + 264 \$1.50

GERMAN

Allwörden, Wilh. v.—Professor Dr. Conrad Borchling zum 65 Geburtstag. Hans Teske.—Die niederdeutsche Dichtung. Robert Petsch.—Hochdeutsche Dichter von der Niederelbe. [Das niederdeutsche Hamburg. 6]. *Hamburg*: Boysen, 1937. 32 pp. 60 Pf.

Arbinger, Nausikaa.—Die Bedeutung der "Allgemeinen Zeitung" für die Literatur von 1890-1914. *Diss. München*: 1936. 67 pp.

Arnold, Hans.—Fritz auf Ferien. Ed. with Notes, Exercises, and Vocabulary, by Ralph W. Haller. *Boston*: D. C. Heath & Co. [1937]. iv, 87 pp. 68 cts.

Behrend, Fritz.—Deutsche Studien II. Vorträge und Abhandlungen. *Berlin*: Hermann Wendt, 1937. M. 2.50

Beretta-Piccoli, Maria.—Die Benennung der weiblichen Kopftracht des Landvolks der deutschen Schweiz. *Diss. Neuenburg*: 1936. 199 pp.

Citoni, L.—Contributi di Lessing all'estetica. *Palermo*: "La luce," [1936]. 25 pp.

Dietz, Martin.—Der Wortschatz der neueren Leibesübungen. *Diss. Heidelberg*: Meister, 1936. 143 pp.

Frenzen, Wilhelm.—Klagebilder und Klagegebärden in der deutschen Dichtung des hofischen Mittelalters. *Diss. Bonn*. *Wurzburg*: Triltsch, 1936. 85 pp.

Gehl, Walther.—Ruhm und Ehre bei den Nordgermanen. Studien zum Lebensgefühl der isländ. Saga. *Diss. Leipzig*: [Neue Deutsche Forschungen. Abt. Deu. Philologie, Bd. 3]. *Berlin*: Junker & Dunnhaupt, 1937. 170 pp. M. 7.50.

Glogner, Günther.—Der mittelhochdeutsche Lucidarius, eine mittelalterliche Summa. [Forschungen zur deutschen Sprache u. Dichtung. H. 8 = *Diss. Frankfurt*]. *Münster*: Aschendorff, 1937. viii, 74 pp. M. 2.80.

Guggenbuhl, Adolf.—Warum nicht Schweizerdeutsch? Gegen die Missachtung unserer Muttersprache. *Zurich*: Guggenbuhl & Huber, 1937. 39 pp. Fr. 1.50.

Hagboldt, Peter, and Kaufmann, F. W.—A Brief Course in German. *Boston*: D. C. Heath & Co. [1937] viii, 118 pp. 92 cts.

Henschke, Karl Heinrich.—Pommersche Sagengestalten. Diss. *Greifswald*. 1936. 92 pp.

Hewitt, Theodore B.—Idiomatic German Conversation. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1937. viii, 126 pp. \$1.00.

Horovitz, Ruth.—Vom Roman des jungen Deutschland zum Roman der Gartenlaube. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des deutschen Liberalismus. Diss. *Basel*. *Breslau*: M. & H. Marcus, 1937. 146 pp. M. 6.

Huch, Rudolf.—Mein Weg Lebenserinnerungen. Mit Zeichnungen von Prof. Paul Horst-Schulze. *Zeulenroda*: Sporn, 1937. 420 pp. M. 6.80.

Italaander, R.—Gebrüder Lenz auf Tippelfahrt, ed. H. Shapero. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1937. 64 pp. \$3.00.

Jährliche Rundschau des Deutschschweizerischen Sprachvereins. 1936. *Zurich*: Deutschschweizerischer Sprachverein [1937] 56 pp. Fr. 0.80.

Jolles, Charlotte.—Fontane und die Politik. Ein Beitrag zur Wesensbestimmung Theodor Fontanes. Diss. *Berlin*, Teildruck. *Bernburg*: Kunze, 1936. vi, 58 pp.

Jordan, E. L.—Deutsche Kulturgeschichte im Abriss. *New York*: Crofts, 1937. xvi, 205 pp.

Kayser, Wolfgang.—Geschichte der deutschen Ballade. *Berlin*: Junker & Dunnhaupt, 1936. x, 328 pp. M. 8.

Klemann, Elisabeth.—Die Entwicklung des Schicksalsbegriffs in der deutschen Klassik und Romantik. Diss. *Heidelberg*. *Würzburg*: Mayr, 1936. 175 pp.

Koch, Ernst.—Dauer im Wechsel, an expository prose reader. *New York*: Prentice-Hall, 1937. xii, 125 pp. \$1.25.

Lang, E. A.—Ludwig Tieck's Early Concept of Catholic Clergy in America. *Catholic U. diss.*, 1936. xvi, 249 pp.

Langewiesche, Wolfgang.—Das amerikanische Abenteuer, deutscher Werkstudent in U. S. A., ed. F. B. and L. R. Bradley. *New York*: Prentice-Hall, 1937. vi, 230 pp. \$1.45.

May, Kurt.—Deutsche Prosa im 18. Jahrhundert. Ausgew. Texte zur Geschichte des deutschen Stils vom Barock bis zur Klassik. [Literarhistorische Bibl. Bd. 18]. *Berlin*: Junker & Dunnhaupt, 1937. 116 pp. M. 3.40.

Michels, Josef.—Goethes Werther. Beiträge zum Formproblem des jungen Goethe. (Gekürzte Fassung). Diss. *Erlangen*. *Kiel*: Lipsius & Tischer, 1936. 61 pp.

Nock, Francis J.—An Introduction to Scientific German. *New York*: Macmillan, 1937. xii, 148 pp. \$1.25.

Selmer, Carl.—An unrecorded Old German Augustinian Rule, ed. with a description and definition of the dialect. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1937. 19 pp. \$5.00.

Thomssen, Harald.—Die Herkunft und Bedeutung der in Dithmarschen vorkommenden Vornamen. [Kleines Dithmarscher Namensbuch. T. 1]. *Heide*: Lund [1937]. 88 pp. M. 1.

Trabert, Magda.—Friedrich Schlegels Weg von der romantischen zur christlichen Anthropologie. Diss. *Bonn*: 1936. 122 pp.

Trubners deutsches Wörterbuch, im Auftrag der Arbeitsgemeinschaft für deutsche Wortforschung, herausgegeben von Alfried Gotze. G.-Geier. *Berlin*: de Gruyter, 1937. 64 pp. M. 1.

Vries, Jan de.—Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte. Bd. 2. [Grundriss der german. Philologie. 12/2. Religion der Nordgermanen]. xv, 460 pp. M. 12.

Unger, Rudolf.—Richtungen und Probleme neuerer Schiller-Deutung. [Nachrichten von der Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen. Philol.-hist. Kl. Fachgr. 4, N. F. Bd. 1, Nr. 9]. *Göttingen*: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1937. Pp. 203-242. M. 2.

Wagner, Gisela.—Holderlin und die Vorklassiker. Diss. *Frankfurt*. *Würzburg*: Triltsch, 1937. v, 191 pp. M. 4.50.

Wahmann, Paul.—Gnade. Der ahd. Wortschatz im Bereich der Gnade, Gunst und Liebe. Diss. *Münster*. [Neue deutsche Forschungen. Abt. Deu. Philologie, Bd. 4]. *Berlin*: Junker & Dunnhaupt, 1937. 178 pp. M. 8.

Willmsky, Horst-Joachim.—Johann Gottfried Seume als Reiseschriftsteller. Diss. *Greifswald*: Adler, 1936. 85 pp.

Zeydel, Edmond H.—Graded German Reader for Beginners. With Questions and Exercises. *New York*: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1937. ix, 153 pp. \$1.00.

FRENCH

André-Vincent, Ph.—Les idées politiques de Chateaubriand. *Paris*: Recueil Sirey, 1936. 233 pp. Fr. 26.

Atkinson, G.—Supplément au répertoire bibliog. se rapportant à la litt. géog. fr. de la Renaissance. *Paris*: Picard, 1936. 88 pp. Fr. 30.

Badel, A.—Chez les Français. A reader. ed. T. R. Palfrey and W. C. Holbrook. *New York*: Farrer and Rinehart, 1937. xcv + 158 pp. \$1.25.

Balzac et Voiture.—Œuvres choisies. éd. G. Raibaud. *Paris*: Larousse, 1936. 120 pp. Fr. 1.50.

Balzac.—The Student's Balzac, ed W S Hastings. *New York*: Crofts, 1937. 286 pp.

Beguín, A.—L'âme romantique et le rêve 2 v. *Paris*: Corti, 1937. 336 + 480 pp. Fr. 60.

Benjamin, R.—La prodigieuse vie d'H de Balzac. *Paris*: Nelson, 1937. 384 pp. Fr. 8 50

Blondheim, D. S.—Les gloses françaises dans les commentaires talmudiques de Raschi. II, études lexicographiques. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1937. 172 pp \$2.50. (JHS, extra xi.)

Bouleau.—Epistres, éd. crit *Paris*: Droz, 1937. vi + 111 pp. (Soc. des textes fr. m.). Fr. 15.

Bonnerot, J.—Biblog. de l'œuvre de Sainte-Beuve *Paris*: Giraud-Badin, 1937 530 pp Fr. 80.

Bourciez, Édouard.—Précis historique de phonétique française 8^e éd., revue et corrigée *Paris*: Klincksieck, 1937. xlviii + 333 pp Fr 36

Bowen, Reginald.—La formation du féminin de l'adjectif et du participe passé dans les dialectes normands, picards et wallons d'après l'atlas ling. de la Fr. *Paris*: Droz, 1937. 131 pp.

Brasillach, R.—Animateurs du théâtre (Copeau, Jouvet, etc) *Paris*: Corrèa, 1936 224 pp. Fr. 12.

Buchner, Marie L.—A Contrib to the study of the Descriptive Technique of J-J. Rousseau. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1937. 184 pp. \$1.25. (J. H. Studies, 30.)

Ceppi, M.—Twelve Fr Plays. *Boston*: Heath, 1937. 128 pp. \$ 48.

—L'Aventure de Ted Bopp. *Ibid.*, 1937. 63 pp. \$ 32.

Chapelain.—Opuscules critiques, éd. A C Hunter *Paris*: Droz, 1936. 535 pp. Fr. 50. (Soc. des textes fr. mod.)

Charpentier, John.—Baudelaire *Paris*: Tallandier, 1937. 256 pp. Fr. 15.

Chartier, A.—La belle dame sans merci, éd. A Pagès. Texte fr. et trad. Catalane *Paris*: Droz, 1937. 50 pp. Fr. 16.

Citoleux, M.—Le vrai Montaigne, théologien et soldat *Paris*: Lethielleux, 1937 315 pp.

Constant, B.—Adolphe, éd Beau de Loménie. *Paris*: Larousse, 1936. 96 pp. Fr. 1.75.

Conte de Poitiers, le roman du treizième s., éd. V. F. Koenig. *Paris*: Droz, 1937. xxiv + 63 pp.

Corneille.—Pompée, éd. R. Pangaud *Paris*: Larousse, 1936. 100 pp. Fr. 1.50.

—Rodogune, éd. R. Pangaud. *Ibid.*, 1937. 104 pp. Fr. 1.50.

—Sertorius, éd. P. Mélése. *Ibid.*, 1936. 92 pp. Fr. 1.50.

Coville, A.—Le petit Jehan de Saintré. *Paris*: Droz, 1937. 134 pp. Fr. 15

Dargan, E P.—Anatole France, 1844-96 *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1937. xxxiv + 729 pp. \$5 00.

Des Grantz Geanz, an Anglo-Norman poem, ed. G. E. Brereton. *Oxford*: Blackwell, 1937. xxxvii + 58 pp. 10s. 6d. (Medium Ævum Monographs, 2)

Dumas, A.—Poètes nouveaux. *Paris*: Delagrave, 1937 446 pp Fr 15.

Dumesnil, R.—L'éducation sent de G Flaubert. *Paris*: Malfère, 1937. 216 pp. Fr. 12

Fabre, M.—Voltaire et Pimpette de Nîmes *Nîmes*: Chastanier et Almeras, 1936. 63 pp.

Fellows, O. E.—French opinion of Molière (1800-50). *Providence*: Brown U., 1937. 141 pp. (Brown U Studies, 3.) \$1.75.

Feuillerat, A.—Paul Bourget *Paris*: Plon, 1937. 440 pp. Fr. 24.

Flaubert—Mme Bovary. Salammbô, Trois contes, éd. A. Lœwel. *Paris*: Eds. de Cluny, 1936-7 xvi + 439 + xv + 336 + xvi + 177 pp. Fr. 12 each.

—, éd. J. Nathan. *Ibid.*, 1936. 124 pp. Fr. 1.75.

—Œuvres, éd Thibaudet et Dumesnil. *Paris*: Gallimard, 1936. 1070 + 1007 pp. Fr. 150.

Florès, Pierre.—Le drame intérieur de P. Loti. *Paris*: Ed. du Courrier, 1937. 268 pp. Fr. 50.

Fontaine, A.—Veilaine, homme de lettres. *Paris*: Delagrave, 1937. 144 pp. Fr. 20.

Frappier, J.—Etude sur la mort le roi Artu. *Paris*: Droz, 1937. 424 pp. Fr. 60.

Gide, A.—Œuvres complètes, éd. Martin-Chauffier. xi. *Paris*: Gallimard, 1936. xii + 402 pp.

Gohin, Fr.—La Fontaine *Paris*: Garnier, 1937. 256 pp. Fr. 15.

Green, Julien.—Mont-Cinère, ed C T Stewart *New York*: Harper, 1937. xii + 396 pp. \$1.20.

Haxo, H. E.—Intermediate Fr reader. *New York*: Macmillan, 1937. Pp. viii + 463.

Hendel, C. W.—Citizen of Geneva. Selections [trans] from the letters of J-J Rousseau *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1937. xiv + 405 pp \$3 50.

Karl, Ludwig—J Racine, eine psychologische Charakterstudie mit einem Anhang über Universitätsgründungen u. Erziehung des Jesuitenordens im Barockzeitalter. *Vienna*: Fr. Leo, 1937. 85 pp. RM. 2.50.

Lamartine.—Les Visions, éd H Guillemin. *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1936. 258 pp. Fr. 30.

Lancaster, H. C.—Principal rules of Fr. pronunciation. 4th ed. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1937. 16 pp. \$1.15.

Lecompte, I. C. and Sundeen, M. V.—Unified Fr. Course. *Boston*: Heath, 1937. xiv + 600 + lxxii pp. \$1 96.

Lescoffier, J.—Bjoinson et la France *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1936. 95 pp. Fr. 20.

Li fet des Romains, éd L. F. Flutré et K. Sneyders de Vogel I *Paris*: Droz, 1937. 750 pp. Fr. 80

Linskill, Joseph.—Saint Léger, étude de la langue du ms. de Clermont-Ferrand, suivie d'une éd. crit. du texte. *Paris*: Droz, 1937. viii + 192 pp.

Lorde, A. de et Marsèle, J.—Napoléonette, éd E. Sonet and E. F. Meylan. *Boston*: Houghton Mifflin, 1937. viii + 215 pp. \$.96

Malherbe.—Poésies, II, éd. crit par J. Lavaud. *Paris*: Droz, 1937. 209 pp. Fr. 25. (Soc. des textes fr. M.)

Marivaux.—L'Ecole des mères, éd G. Michaut. *Paris*: Hatier, 1937. 80 pp. Fr. 1 65.

Maupassant, Daudet, Bazin, Bordeaux.—Les pauvres gens, éd. O. F. Bond. *Boston*: Heath, 1937. vi + 55 pp. \$.28.

Mauron, Marie.—Mont-Paon ou "Messieurs et chers administrés . . ." *Paris*: Denoel [N. Y.: Oxford Press], 1937. 285 pp.

Montjean, Ch.—La troupe de Molière à Saint-Germain-en-Laye au XVII^e s. *Mesnil (Eure)*, Firmin-Didot, 1937. 18 pp.

Moreau, P.—Les destinées d'A de Vigny. *Paris*: Malfère, 1937. 192 pp. Fr. 12.

Mort le roi Artu, la., roman du XIII^e s., éd. J. Frappier. *Paris*: Droz, 1936. lxxviii + 257 pp. Fr. 40.

Musset.—Il ne faut jurer de rien. Ed. J. Nathan *Paris*: Larousse, 1936. 64 pp. Fr. 1.50.

Nitze, W. A.—Le haut livre du Graal, Perlesvaus, II, commentary and notes *Chicago*: U of Chicago Press, 1937. xiv + 398 pp. \$4 50

Nouaillac, J.—Le Mariage de Marmontel *Brive*: Lachaise, 1936. 53 pp.

Pauphilet, A.—Hist de la litt. fr I Moyen Age *Paris*: Delalain, 1937. 155 pp. Fr. 20.

Pesme, G.—En flânant chez Montesquieu à la Brède. *Bordeaux*: Delmas, 1937. 48 pp. Fr. 5.

Peyre, H. and Grant, E. M.—Seventeenth Century Fr. prose and poetry. *Boston*: Heath, 1937. viii + 351 pp. \$1.72

Posadowsky-Wehner, K. Graf v.—Jean Parmentier (1494-1529). *Leben und Werk*. *Munch*: Hueber, 1937. 99 pp.

Proverbes en rimes, text and illustrations of the fifteenth century from a Fr. MS. in the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, by Grace Frank and Dorothy Miner. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1937. x + 120 pp. + 186 plates. \$2 75.

Racan.—Les Bergeries, éd. crit. par L. Arnould *Paris*: Droz, 1937. xxxvi + 203 pp (Soc. des textes fr. m.). Fr. 40.

Racine.—Poésies, éd G. Truc, avec Racine et la musique, par G. Samazeuilh. *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1936. xvi + 169 pp. Fr. 18.

Rageot, G.—Mme du Deffand *Paris*: Michel, 1937. 256 pp. Fr. 10.

Reynaud, Camille.—La genèse de "Dominique." *Paris*: Arthaud, 1937. 240 pp. Fr. 30.

Rivarol.—Discours sur l'universalité de la langue fr., éd. M. Favergeat. *Paris*: Larousse, 1936. 76 pp. Fr. 1 50.

Roman d'Alexandre.—I. Text of Arsenal and Venice Versions, éd. Milan S. La Du II. Version of Alexandre de Paris text, éd. E. C. Armstrong, D. L. Buffum, B. Edwards, L. F. H. Lowe. *Princeton*: U. Press, 1937. xxiv + 495 + xxvi + 358 pp. (Elliott Monographs, 36, 37)

Ronsard.—Œuvres compl. IX, opuscules de 1558-9, éd. crit. par P. Laumonier. *Paris*: Droz, 1937. xxii + 205 pp. Fr. 30. (Soc. des textes fr. m.)

Rousseau, J.-J.—Prof de foi du vic sav., éd. G. Beaulavon. *Paris*: Hachette, 1937. 204 pp. Fr. 12.

Sammartino and Guastalla.—A Survey of Fr. lit. *New York*: Longmans, Green, 1937. xiv + 271 pp. \$2.00.

Scott, G. C. and Gurney, D.—A Fr. Word-Book *London* [and N. Y.]: Oxford U. Press, 1937. 48 pp. \$.35.

Sedaine.—Phil. sans le savoir, éd E. Feulatre. *Paris*: Larousse, 1936. 92 pp. Fr. 1.50

Seeber, E. D.—Anti-slavery opinion in Fr. during the second half of the eighteenth century. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1937. 238 pp. \$2 50. (JHS, extra vol. 10.)

Sosset, L.-L.—Introd à l'œuvre de Ch de Coster. *Brussels*: Palais des Acads., 1937. 201 pp.

Taylor, F. A.—The Theatre of Alex. Dumas fils. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [N. Y.: Oxford U. Press], 1937. viii + 210 pp. \$5 00.

Thibaudet, A.—Hist de la litt. fr. II *Paris*: Delamain et Boutelleau, 1936. xi + 587 pp. Fr. 25.

Thomas, J.—Sainte-Beuve et l'Ecole normale, 1834-67. *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1937. 203 pp. Fr. 15.

Tronchon, H.—Le jeune Edgar Quinet ou l'aventure d'un enthousiaste. *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1937. viii + 409 pp.

Urwin, K.—Georges Chastelain, la vie, les œuvres. *Diss. Paris*: (Droz) 1937. 246 pp.

Vigny.—Cinq-Mars, éd M. Revon *Paris*: Garnier, 1936. xxxiv + 477 pp. Fr. 9

—Poésies complètes *Paris*: Eds. de Cluny, 1936. xvi + 244 pp. Fr. 12.

Voltaire.—Candide, l'Ingénu, l'Homme aux 40 écus, éd. J. Walter. Paris: Eds de Cluny, 1936. 288 pp. Fr. 12.

Zola.—L'Attaque du moulin, ed. O. F. Bond. V. Boston: Heath, 1937. 60 pp.

ITALIAN

Alghieri, Dante.—*Il Convivio*, ridotto a miglior lezione e commentato da G. Busnelli e G. Vandelli. Con introduzione di M. Barbi. Vol. II. Firenze: Le Monnier, 1937. 464 pp. L. 60

— La div. com. II Purgatorio, ed. I. Del Lungo. Firenze: Le Monnier, 1935. 292 pp.

Angelini, C.—Invito al Manzoni. Brescia: Tip. "La Scuola," 1936. 149 pp. L. 10

Balducci, I.—Carducci e l'ipercritica. Milano: "La prora," 1936. 108 pp. L. 5.

Battaglia, L.—L'infida Albione nel pensiero di Mario Rapisarda. Catania: Tip. E. Giandolfo e C., 1936. 15 pp.

Bertoni, Giulio.—*Lingua e poesia. Saggi di critica letteraria*. Firenze: L. S. Olschki, 1937. 279 pp. L. 30

Betteloni, G.—Il Betteloni nel libro inedito di Gioacchino Brognoligo. Verona: "La tipografica Veronese," 1936. 14 pp.

Boccaccio.—25 novelle scelte del Decam., ed. A. Tortoreto. Vita descritta da L. Dolce. Milano: Soc. ed. naz., 1936. xi + 165 pp. L. 7.

Boiardo, Matteo Maria.—*Tutte le opere di M. M. B.*, a cura di A. Zottoli [Vol. I]. Milano: Mondadori, 1936 (*Classici Mondadori*). Pp. xlii, 863. L. 45.

Borsa, E.—Poesie e chitarrate d'autori lodigiani. Lodi: Tip. G. Biancardi, 1936. 103 pp. L. 5.

Buonarroti, Michelangelo (il Giovane).—La Tancia. Ed. E. Allodoli. Firenze: Tip. Giannini e Giovannelli, 1936. 109 pp. L. 3.

Cafaro, G.—Parliamo di F. T. Marinetti. Lecce: G. Cafaro, 1936. 31 pp. L. 250

Carducci, Giosue.—La coltura estense e la gioventù dell'Ariosto. Bologna: N. Zanichelli, 1936. 391 pp.

Carrara, E.—Tra il Furioso e la Gerusalemme liberata. Torino: Gruppo universitario fascista "Amos Maramotti," 1936. 56 pp.

Castellano, G.—Benedetto Croce. Bari: Laterza, 1936. 208 pp.

Cellini, Benvenuto.—La vita di —. Ed. G. A. Levi. Torino: Soc. ed. Internazionale, 1936. viii + 313 pp. L. 9.50.

Cioffari, V.—Ital review grammar. Boston: Heath, 1937. xii + 202 pp. \$1.36.

Culcasi, C.—Musica e poesia. Rapporti estetici e storici. Milano: Ist. ed. Cisalpino, 1936. 189 pp. L. 10.

Culcasi, C.—I poeti umanisti maggiori. Pontano, Poliziano, Sannazzaro. Milano: Soc. ed. Naz., 1936. 78 pp. L. 4

D'Annunzio, Gabriele.—Il fiore delle laudi. Ed. F. Flora. Milano-Verona: A. Mondadori, [1936] xii + 240 pp. L. 12

Del Grande, C.—Intorno alle origini della tragedia ed altri saggi. Napoli: R. Ricciardi, 1936. 141 pp. L. 10.

Della Casa, Gio.—Opere, a cura di G. Preziosi. Milano: Rizzoli e C., 1937. (*Classici Rizzoli*) 927 pp. L. 40

Demeln, L. A.—La Divine Comédie de Dante Alighieri. Paris: Oeuvres françaises, 1936. 586 pp.

D'Errico, C.—La Rappresentazione di Santa Uliva. Libero rifacimento di —. Roma: Ed. "Sud," 1936. 111 pp. L. 3.50.

Di Natale, L.—Impressioni di teatro. Bologna: L. Cappelli, 1936. 93 pp. L. 8.

Dorschner, F.—Das Brot u. seine Herstellung in Graubünden u. Tessin. Zurich-Leipzig: Niehans, 1936. 203 pp.

Falqui, E.—Sintassi. Milano: "Panorama," 1936. 254 pp. L. 10.

Fava, Dom.—I libri italiani a stampa del secolo XV con figure della Biblioteca nazionale centrale di Firenze. Milano: U. Hoepli, 1936. xxiv + 278 pp.

Flori, E.—Manzoni, Andrea Verga e i Grossi. Da documenti inediti. Milano: "Famiglia Meneghina," 1936. 184 pp. L. 10.

Foscolo, Ugo.—Epistolario raccolto e ordinato da F. S. Orlandini e da E. Mayer. I. Firenze: Le Monnier, 1936. 586 pp. L. 8.

Galilei, Galileo.—Antologia Scritti scelti e coordinati. Ed. G. Faggin. Padova: "Cedam," 1937. xlvii + 114 pp. L. 8.

Gallico, G.—Grammatica italiana della lingua viva. Ad uso delle scuole medie inferiori. Torino: S. Lattes e C., 1937. viii + 213 pp. L. 8

Gastaldi, M.—Donne, luce d'Italia. Panorama della letteratura femminile contemporanea. Milano: Ed. "Quadermi di poesia," 1936. xviii + 865 pp. L. 50.

Gentile, Giovanni.—La tradizione italiana. Firenze: Sansoni, 1936. 34 pp. L. 3.

Giusti, Giuseppe.—Poesie e prose scelte. Ed. B. Cestaro. Torino: Paravia, 1936. xxxii + 239 pp. L. 8.50 (Biblioteca di classici italiani.)

Goldoni.—Commedie scelte. Ed. F. Carlesi. Vol. II. Salsomaggiore Pesa: Soc. ed. Toscana, 1936. xix + 437 pp. L. 5.

—Le baruffe Chiozotte. Ed. M. Dazzi. Milano-Verona: Mondadori, 1936. xlvii + 115 pp. L. 4.

—La bottega del caffè. Ed. E. Rho. Firenze: Vallecchi, 1936. 139 pp. L. 4. (Bibl. di cl. ital.)

- Goldoni. — Il bugiardo. Ed. E. Allodoli. *Palermo*: Sandron, 1935. viii + 82 pp. L. 225.
- Un curioso accidente. Ed. A. Pagano. *Napoli*: P. Federico e G. Ardia, 1936. 79 pp. L. 4.
- La famiglia dell'antiquario. Ed. E. Rho. *Firenze*: A. Vallecchi, 1936. 141 pp. L. 4 (Bibl. di cl. ital.).
- Gli innamorati. Ed. A. Marenduzzo. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1936. 128 pp. L. 2.75.
- La locandiera. Ed. E. Allodoli. *Palermo*: Sandron, 1935. xi + 88 pp. L. 2.
- Ed. G. Bottoni. *Milano*: Signorelli, 1936. 80 pp. L. 3.
- La moglie saggia. Ed. E. Allodoli. *Palermo*. Sandron, 1935. xi + 75 pp. L. 2.
- I pettegolezzi delle donne. Ed. E. Allodoli. *Palermo*: R. Sandron, [1936]. xi + 65 pp. L. 2.
- La serva amorosa. Ed. M. Dazzi. *Milano-Verona*: Mondadori, 1936. 103 pp. L. 4.
- Le smanie per la villeggiatura. Ed. G. Bottoni. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1935. 85 pp. L. 4.
- Il Ventaglio. Ed. E. Allodoli. *Palermo*. R. Sandron, [1936]. vii + 84 pp.
- Tutte le opere. Ed. G. Ortolani. Vol. II. *Milano-Verona*: A. Mondadori, 1936. 1351 pp. L. 45.
- Una delle ultime sere di carnevale a Venezia. Ed. M. C. Picotti. *Firenze*: A. Vallecchi, 1936. 133 pp. L. 4. (Bibl. di cl. ital.).
- Guidetti, Giuseppe. — Scrittore-editore reggiano. Memoria bio-bibliografica. *Reggio d'Emilia*: Guidetti, 1936. 137 pp. L. 10.
- Leopardi. — Canti, ed. V. M. Jeffery. *Cambridge*: U. Press [N. Y.: Macmillan], 1937. x + 114 pp. \$1.40.
- Lo Curzio, Guglielmo. — *La poesia di Luigi Puandello*. *Palermo*: Trimarchi, 1936. 125 pp. L. 8.
- Mabellini, A. — Giambattista Dragoncini da Fano. *Fano*: Tip. letteraria, 1936. 14 pp.
- Malagoli, L. — Il primo Leopardi. *Adria*: Tempo Nostro, 1936.
- Manzoni, Alessandro. — Gli inni sacri. Ed. V. Titone. *Palermo*: Trimarchi, 1936. 61 pp. L. 4.
- Liriche scelte e Adelchi. Ed. L. Pompilj. *Napoli*: A. Morano, 1937. 295 pp. L. 10.
- Mengel, E. — Umlaut und Diphthongierung in den Dialekten des Picenum. 2 Tle. *Köln*: Univ. of Köln Diss., 1936. 259 pp.
- Morando, Ernesto F. — *Studi di letteratura e di storia Firenze*: "La Nuova Italia," 1937. 193 pp. L. 10.
- Natoli et Ricklin. — Poètes italiens contemporains. *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1936. x + 126 pp. Fr. 15.
- Nava, N. — Introduzione ad una poetica nuova. *Modena*: U. Guanda, 1936. 75 pp. L. 5.
- Parmeggiani, L. — Conferenze e reminiscenze carducciane. *Milano*: "La Prora," [1936]. 62 pp. L. 5.
- Pecci, G. — Introduzione e commento del canto XXVII dell' "Inferno." *Faenza*: Tip. fil. Lega, 1936. 31 pp. L. 2.
- Pellico, Silvio. — Le mie prigioni. Ed. A. Luzio. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1936. xvii + 192 pp. L. 5. (Biblioteca di classici italiani.)
- Petrarca, Francesco. — Rime sparse. Ed. G. Chicchirichi. *Alba*: Tip. Pia soc. figlie di S. Paolo, 1936. xxx + 204 pp. L. 6.
- Prati, Giovanni. — Poesie. *Firenze*: A. Salani, 1936. 2 vols. 534, 562 pp. L. 5 each vol.
- Previtera, C. — La poesia e l'arte di Torquato Tasso. *Messina-Milano*: G. Principato, 1936. 342 pp. L. 25.
- Ragni, F. — Vincenzo Giusti, drammaturgo udinese del Cinquecento. *Udine*: Accademia, 1936.
- Ravegnani, G. — Dieci saggi. Dal Petrarca al Manzoni. *Genova*: E. Degli Orfini, 1936. 189 pp. L. 15.
- Rivetta, P. S. (Toddi). — Avventure e disavventure delle parole. Bizzarrie e curiosità linguistiche. *Milano*: Ceschina, 1936. 257 pp. L. 10.
- Rizzi, F. — La casa parmense del Petrarca. *Parma*. Tip. La Bodoniana, 1936.
- Rohlf, G. — Dizionario dial. delle Tre Calabrie, I, 9. *Milano*: U. Hoepli, 1936. Pp. 129-192.
- Rosina, Tito. — Ceccardo Roccatagliata Ceccardi. *Genova*: E. Degli Orfini, 1937. 261 pp. L. 15.
- Rossi, C. — Opere e giorni di Ugo Foscolo. *Milano*: "Nuova Italia," 1936. 142 pp. L. 6.
- Russo, J. L. — First year Ital. *Boston*: Heath, 1937. xx + 481 pp. \$1.80.
- Russo, Luigi. — *Ritratti e disegni storici. Da Machiavelli a Carducci*. *Bari*: Laterza, 1937. 493 pp. L. 30.
- Schuchhard, H. — Beiträge zur Geschichte der italienischen Scheidewörter. *Jena-Leipzig*: W. Gronau, 1936. xvi + 125 pp. (Berliner Beiträge z. roman. Philol., VI, 3.)

Shaw, J. E.—Dante and Bonagiunta. *Cambridge, Mass.*: 18 pp. (Repr. fr. "Report of the Dante Society," April, 1936)

Silli, M. G.—Armonie di vite nel '300. Dante, Firenze, Beatrice. *Firenze*: Libr. edit. Fiorentina, 1936. 159 pp.

Spadoni, C.—Frammenti di liriche manzoniane. *Reggio Emilia*: Tip. Artigianelli di R. Bojardi, 1936. 21 pp.

—Scritti di varia letteratura. *Reggio*: Poesia d'Italia, 1935.

Studi Pascoliani, IV (Società G. Pascoli). *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1936.

Taruschio, L.—Nuova stilistica, ovvero dell' elemento musicale in letteratura. *Macerata*: Tip. A. Slavi, 1936. 91 pp.

Tasso, Torquato.—La Gerusalemme liberata. Ed. E. Zanette. *Torino*: Soc. edit. Internazionale, 1936. lxvii + 597 pp. L. 15.

Tassoni, Alessandro.—La secchia rapita. Ed. C. Culcasi. *Milano*: Soc. ed. Nazionale, 1936. 90 pp. L. 6.

Torracca, F.—"Di maltolletto . . ." *Roma*: Albighi, Segati e C., 1936. 40 pp.

Ulargiu, V.—L'Antigone di Sofocle e di Vittorio Alfieri. Parallelo critico-estetico *Iglesias*: Atzeni e Ferrara, 1935-1936. 243 pp. L. 10.

Un cinquantennio di studi sulla letteratura italiana (1886-1936). Saggi raccolti a cura della società filologica romana e dedicati a Vittorio Rossi. *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1937. Pp. xvi, 399; 273. L. 70

Uva, N.—La Puglia dialettale. I. *Corato*: "La disfidà," 1936. 97 pp. L. 6

Wahlgren, E. G.—Evoluzione semasiologica d'alcune parole dotte nell' italiano *Uppsala och Stockholm*: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1936. 32 pp.

Zini, Z.—Vincenzo Gioberti, 1801-1852. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1936. 112 pp. L. 5.

SPANISH

Buck, V. H.—Four Autos sacramentales of 1590. *Iowa City*: U. of Iowa Studies (no. 7), 1937. 99 pp.

Crawford, J. P. W.—Spanish drama before Lope de Vega. *Philadelphia*: U. of Pa. Press, 1937. viii + 211 pp. \$2.00.

Henriquez Urefia, Max.—Les influences françaises sur la poésie hispano-américaine. *Paris*: Inst. des études américaines, 1937. 12 pp.

Juretschke, H.—Das Frankreichbild des modernen Spanien. *Bochum-Langendreer*: Pöppinghaus, 1937. 159 pp.

Lopez de Lowther, M.—A Spanish Composition. *New York*: Harper, 1937. x + 374 pp. \$1.60.

Mérimée, P.—L'Influence française en Espagne au XVIII^e s. *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1936. 120 pp. Fr. 9. (Etudes fr.)

Ocantos, Carlos María, León Zaldivar, ed. W. F. Rice. *New York*: Crofts, 1937. x + 159 pp. \$1.30.

Steiner, S. J.—Progressive Spanish. *New York*: Harper, 1937. xvi + 320 pp.

Tarr, F. C. and Centeno, A.—Shorter Sp. review grammar and comp. *New York*: Crofts, 1937. viii + 208 pp. \$1.25.

Weyl, Helene.—José Ortega y Gasset, repr. U. of Toronto Quarterly, VI (1937), 461-479.

PROVENÇAL

Bruck, Eberhard.—Crousillat, ein Troubadour des 19 Jhr. Halle diss., 1936. 107 pp.

Catalan, Arnaut.—Le poesie del trovatore —. Ed. F. Blasi. *Firenze*: L. S. Olschki, 1937. xxxi + 62 pp. L. 40.

GENERAL

Brahm, W. T.—Bibliog. of pubs of Western Reserve U., 1822-1936. *Cleveland*: W. R. Bulletin, XL, 1937. 83 pp.

Chauvet, P.—Au fil de la mort. *Paris*: La Caravelle, 1937. 110 pp. Fr. 6.

Collinson, W. E. and Morris, A. V.—Indication, a study of demonstratives, articles, and other 'indicators.' Language Monographs, no. 17, April-June, 1937. 128 pp.

Dahlerup, V.—Ordbog over det danske Sprog. Præst-huæg. *Copenhagen*: Gyldendalske Boghandel, 1937. 1495 + 8 pp.

Haugen, E. I.—Beginning Norwegian. *New York*: Crofts, 1937. xiv + 214 pp. \$1.85

Kurz, R. F.—Journal, trans. M. Jarrell, ed. J. N. B. Hewitt. *Washington*: Smithsonian, 1937. x + 382 pp. (Bureau of Am. Ethnol., 115.)

Labhardt, A.—Contributions à la critique et à l'explication des gloses de Reichenau. Neuchâtel diss., 1936. x + 107 pp.

Michelson, Truman.—Fox Miscellany. *Washington*: Smithsonian, 1937. 124 pp. (Bureau of Am. Ethnology, 114.)

Pushkin.—His novel in verse Eugene Onegin, trans. by D. P. Radin and G. Z. Patrick. *Berkeley*: U. of Cal. Press, 1937. viii + 226 pp. \$2.50.

Travaux du séminaire de philologie romane. *Istanbul*: Devlet Basimevi, 1937. 314 pp.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LII

DECEMBER, 1937

Number 8

PRE-RESTORATION POETRY IN DRYDEN'S MISCELLANY

Few attempts have been made to study thoroughly the reading habits of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries; and because today we usually read only the leading neo-classicists of the period, we frequently assume that they contributed most of the poetic reading matter. Many Elizabethan and early seventeenth-century poems and ballads did not, however, die the sudden death that the neo-classic critics planned for them, but lived on to help while away the idle hours of readers until at least 1727, when the final edition of Dryden's Miscellany appeared. Professor Raymond D. Havens has noted that, whereas from the publication of the first volume in 1684 until the appearance of the sixth in 1709 this anthology was almost completely neo-classic, the collected edition of 1716 introduced significant changes in contents, particularly in the inclusion of pre-Restoration poems and ballads. He has therefore asked "Why, after three decades of popularity as an anthology of late seventeenth and very early eighteenth-century poetry, the scope of the collection was suddenly enlarged?"¹ The answer lies, I believe, in the late seventeenth-century drolleries, miscellanies, and commonplace books; and these works, in turn, offer the best means of determining reading tastes, for the first two were designed to satisfy the public and the last represents the actual reading of individuals.

During the Commonwealth period many Elizabethan and Jacobean songs passed on to popular tradition, while the songs from the Elizabethan plays were usually remembered apart from their original settings. The result was that these lyrics, together with many

¹ R. D. Havens, "Changing Taste in the Eighteenth Century," *PMLA*, XLIV (1929), 508.

ballads, became common property and remained popular among the general mass of readers. Authors, dates, and sources were forgotten, but the poems survived in the song books and miscellanies for popular consumption. Many mid-seventeenth-century song books, such as John Playford's *Select Musical Ayres and Dialogues* (1653) and *Catch that Catch Can: or the Musical Companion* (1667), contain, for example, a number of Shakespeare's poems, Breton's "In the merry month of May," and Campion's "Though I am young and cannot tell." In consequence, these poems and many like them, such as Wither's "Shall I wasting in despair" and Marlowe's "Come live with me and be my love," became popular songs and reappeared frequently in the later miscellanies. True, the collectors were selective, choosing usually the more suggestively sensual pieces, but in almost all those chosen, Elizabethan and Jacobean lyricism is evident. Often garbled and usually without the authors' names, the lyrics were later reprinted along with the products of the neo-classic school; for the late seventeenth century was not completely given over to the newer doctrines and tastes, but constituted in many respects a period of literary revolt and consequent anarchy, an anarchy that is revealed in the contents of the miscellanies. Indeed, most of the compilers and the average reader probably failed to detect any great distinction between the earlier and the current poems. John Cotgrave, editor of *Wit's Interpreter*, included in his miscellany many neo-classic pieces, some early seventeenth-century poems (such as Carew's "He that loves a rosy cheek"), and many Elizabethan products (such as songs by Fletcher, Jonson, and Raleigh); yet, in the preface to the 1671 edition he wrote: "If there be any copies transcribed that are old, it was not the intention, but rather the misfortune of the *Insertor*; for, upon the least intimation whilst I was in Town to attend the Press, I crossed out whatsoever I could hear had been formerly published." On the other hand, the editor of *The Holborn-Drollery* (1673) recognized fully the presence of pre-Restoration poems in the drolleries; "two or three *Prologues*, and as many *Epilogues*, with some few *Stanzas* Venerable for their Antiquity," he wrote in the preface, "are their Ingredients."

Late seventeenth-century commonplace books indicate that the current miscellanies were the most popular poetic reading matter, and these miscellanies, in turn, reveal the extensive popular appeal the earlier poems still retained. The drolleries—seventeenth-century collections of light, often frivolous, verse—were derived directly

from the songs in Elizabethan plays and were first published surreptitiously to permit the Royalists to keep alive the memory of merry England. As they developed into more reputable works in the late Commonwealth period, they began to include the newer neo-classic pieces, but were seldom unadorned with the earlier products. *The Choyce Drollery* of 1656 contains, along with some pieces by Fletcher and Carew, Drayton's "Dowsabell." *Merry Drollery*, which appeared in 1661, 1670, and 1691, includes poems by Thomas Heywood, Shirley, Fletcher, Bacon, Jonson, Middleton, and Corbet; and in the 1670 edition Breton's "In the merry month of May," which had by now become a popular song, was added. *The Westminster Drollery* of 1671, 1672, and 1674, likewise makes inharmonious bedfellows of poems by Dryden, Shadwell, Etherege, D'Avenant, and Wycherley on the one hand, and by Thomas Lodge, Francis Davison, Raleigh, Lyly, Corbet, and Carew on the other. I mention these three collections in particular because their popularity, as indicated by the number of editions and by the commonplace books, seems to have been very great; but other miscellanies just as clearly show the survival of a taste for the older poetry. The 1669 edition of *The New Academy of Complements* and the two editions of 1684, for instance, drew heavily upon the songs from Shakespeare's plays; and *Wit Restor'd* (1658) and *Wit and Drollery* (1661, 1682)—to name only a few—likewise included earlier lyrics and ballads.

At least, then, until the end of the seventeenth century the poetic anthologies were a heterogeneous mixture of current products—some ribald, some honest attempts at poetry in a new vein—and of older poems. The age, just as much as the miscellanies, was in a state of transition, and there were still many readers who had an affection for pre-Restoration poetry. Neo-classicism remained an esoteric, aristocratic aesthetics that had not yet won over the great mass of readers. Meanwhile, with the appearance of Dryden's Miscellany, another type of anthology arose, devoted almost exclusively to current poems—epilogues and prologues, satires, translations, and sophisticated, polished songs.² Until 1684, when the first volume of the laureate's Miscellany appeared, most anthologies were purely of a popular nature and sported such titles as *Cupid's Posies*

² It should be pointed out, however, that the Miscellany had its origins in such earlier collections as *The Covent Garden Drollery* (1672), which is also made up largely of epilogues, prologues, and songs, but which lacks the serious literary purpose of the collections which follow Dryden's.

and *The Shepherds Garland of Love, Loyalty, and Delight*. But thereafter the majority of the collections took a more serious and literary turn, and the very next year saw the appearance of works that aped not only the nature of the contents but even the title of Dryden's anthology *Miscellany Poems and Translations by Oxford Hands, Miscellany, Being a Collection of Poems by Several Hands*, Tate's *Poems by Several Hands*; A. Stephen's *Miscellany Poems and Translations*, and Mrs. Behn's *Miscellany*. The literateurs were usurping what had formerly been almost entirely a popular type of publication.

On the basis of this brief survey of the Restoration anthologies, we can perhaps arrive at a satisfactory answer to Professor Havens's question. Dryden's *Miscellany* was undoubtedly the most popular of the early eighteenth-century anthologies, but perhaps the presence of the poet's name on the title-page contributed much to this. At any rate, this compilation was different from those that had preceded and, in view of the contents of the earlier ones, does not seem to have represented popular tastes. From the printing of the first volume in 1684 until the printing of the fourth in 1694, Dryden, nominally at least, held the editorship of the *Miscellany*, and the contents therefore conformed with the ideas of the select, fashionable, sophisticated literary group of which he was the leader. After the poet's death, Tonson published two additional volumes, 1704 and 1709, and re-edited volumes one to four, 1702-1708; but as all these were volumes added to the same series or new editions of former volumes, he may have felt bound to consistency in selection. In 1716, however, he published all six volumes collectively for the first time and, because he was beginning afresh, was able to alter the editorial policy. Now, Tonson was a shrewd business man above all else and did not use his publishing firm to champion literary causes or mould literary tastes. No longer under Dryden's restraint and, although he continued to use Dryden's name on the title-page, no longer able to attract strongly the fashionable groups through the use of it sixteen years after the editor's death, he seems to have planned, therefore, to make the contents more popular and thereby widen their appeal. The sources to which a popular anthologist would turn in 1716 to attract a wide audience provide an interesting comment on early eighteenth-century reading tastes. The editor did not make much use of additional contemporary poems, but employed instead earlier products. In other words, he appears to

have recognized the survival of a taste for earlier poems and ballads and consequently made the collection more like the earlier popular miscellanies.³

The extensive, hitherto unnoticed use that Tonson made in 1716 of at least four seventeenth-century drolleries, *Wit and Drollery*, *The Garland of Good-Will*, *The Loyal Garland*, and *Parnassus Biceps*, indicates clearly how consciously he was searching for a definite sort of additional material, to what extent he was fashioning the 1716 edition on the seventeenth-century drolleries, how popular much of the earlier literature must still have been,⁴ and how incomplete a judgment it is to think of the early eighteenth century as completely neo-classic and anti-lyrical. It is apparent that the editor of the Miscellany thumbed through each of the earlier collections, choosing what he thought most likely to please, for in each case the additional poems in the Miscellany appear in the same order as in the drolleries. The editor, then, was induced to turn to these sources, not because of his interest in specific poems, but because of his interest in the popular drolleries and because of his recognition of their continued appeal. It therefore becomes obvious why Tonson selected certain pre-Restoration poems and did not include others; his source was limited largely to the drolleries, and he therefore used what they provided rather than what might occasionally have been more judicious selections from pre-Restoration poets.

The 1682 edition of *Wit and Drollery* is typical of the more widely-read miscellanies of the second half of the century and, like *The Westminster Drollery* or *The Merry Drollery*, contains both

³ At least one poem typical of the contents of the drolleries had, however, slipped into the Miscellany even before the 1716 edition. In the fourth volume (1694, etc.) was printed, wrongly ascribed to Sidney Godolphin, A. W.'s "It chanc'd of late a shepherd swain," which first appeared in Francis Davison's *Poetical Rhapsody*; the version in Dryden's Miscellany is definitely allied with the version published in an earlier drollery, *Le Prince d'Amour* (1660), rather than with the original.

⁴ Tonson may have planned to include poems from the earlier drolleries in the first edition of the sixth volume (1709), for in that volume there is a gap between pp. 632 and 723. In the preface to the sixth volume, Tonson wrote, possibly with reference to this omission: "I have been forced to omit several of the Copies sent, . . . otherways this Volume would have swell'd beyond the Size of any of the former ones. I shall reserve those for another Volume. . . ." This gap was later filled in the 1716 edition, the first appearance of the Miscellany after the 1709 volume, largely by ballads and "Ancient Songs."

Drollery, and they seem to have been favorites throughout the entire last half of the seventeenth and the early eighteenth centuries. In different versions, the second, third, fourth, and fifth poems had been printed in *Wit Restor'd* (1658), and the sixth had already appeared in uncorrupted form as "Hunting of the Gods" in *Westminster Drollery* (1672).⁸

The fourth volume of the Miscellany likewise draws extensively from *Wit and Drollery* for some of its additional poems. Here again the versions are identical, and the poems appear in the same order in each anthology, although they do not immediately succeed each other in *Wit and Drollery*. These borrowed poems are also ballads, street-songs, and lighter, occasionally ribald lyrics: (1) "Good Advice," (2) "The Lancashire Song," (3) "The Leather Bottel," (4) "The Maiden's Longing," (5) "The Hobgoblin," (6) "Sir Eglamore," (7) "The Gelding of the Devil," (8) "The Old Courtier," (9) "Narcissus," (10) "The Jovial Tinker," (11) "I sigh'd and I writ," (12) "Experience," and (13) "A Rant against Cupid." These, too, had been very popular throughout the late seventeenth century: the third appeared in *Parnassus Biceps*; the fourth, in *Merry Drollery*, *Windsor Drollery*, and *New Academy of Complements* (1669, 1684); the fifth, in *Academy of Complements* (1669); the sixth, in *Merry Drollery*, *Antidote Against Melancholy* (1661), *New Academy of Complements* (1684), and Playford's *Musical Companion* (1687); the seventh, in *Merry Drollery*, *Antidote Against Melancholy*, and *Wit and Mirth* (1684); the eighth, in *Le Prince d'Amour* (1660); and the tenth, in *Merry Drollery*.

For some of the poems added to the fifth volume, the editor turned to *The Garland of Good-Will*,⁹ which was probably collected and partly written by Thomas Deloney, and selected (1) "A Song of the Banishment of the two Dukes of Hereford and Norfolk," (2) "A Pastoral Song" ("Upon a Down where Shepherds keep"),¹⁰ (3) "A Dialogue between Plain Truth and Ignorance," (4) "A Dialogue between Fancy and Desire," (5) "A Farewel to

⁸ The two versions are collated by Hales and Furnivall, *op cit*, III, 303.

⁹ Reprinted in *Percy Society Reprints*, vol. 30. The editor, J. H. Dixon, made use of the 1678 and 1709 editions but noted editions of 1631, 1659, 1685, 1688, and 1696. The collector of the Miscellany probably used one of the last three.

¹⁰ (1) and (2) were omitted in the 1727 edition of the Miscellany.

Love." Tonson was obviously not catering to the fashionable neo-classic interest in modernity, for to the title of (1) he added "very Ancient," and to (2), "Ancient." Of these poems it is notable that (4) is by Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford, that (5), with many variations, had been set to music and published in 1588 by William Byrd, and that all five give indications of having been written before 1600; yet, there were far more neo-classical poems that could have been chosen from *The Garland*.

The additional poems in the sixth volume of the Miscellany were recruited largely from *The Loyal Garland*, a fifth edition of which appeared in 1686,¹¹ and *Parnassus Biceps*, 1656.¹² Seven of the nine poems selected from the former are titled in the Miscellany "Ancient Songs": (1) "Dear *Dorinda*, weep no more," (2) "Let *Jug* in Smiles be ever seen," (3) "If Wealth a Man could keep alive," (4) "A Silly Shepherd would, but wist not," (5) "Beauty and Love once fell at odds," (6) "Farewel my Mistress, I'll be gone," (7) "No Man Love's fiery Passion can approve." The edition employed for the Miscellany was probably not older than the other drolleries used; but the fact that *The Loyal Garland* was printed in black letter was undoubtedly responsible for the general title of the poems. The other two pieces are: (8) "The Answer" ("No Man Love's fiery Passion can resist") and (9) "A Pastoral Song" ("Did you not once, *Lucinda*, vow"). Of these, (5) appeared in *New Academy of Complements* (1669, 1684) and *Wits Interpreter* (1671), (7), in *New Academy of Complements* (1669, 1670, and 1684), *Merry Drollery*, and *Wit and Drollery*; (8), in *Oxford Drollery* (1671); and (9), in *Wits Interpreter*.

In selecting from *Parnassus Biceps*, the editor of the Miscellany did not print the poems in immediate succession, but interposed pieces by Corbet and Dryden, and "The Waking of Angantyr." However, it is evident that he employed this drollery, for identical versions appear in each collection, even to the details of titles and the curious manner of printing (6) in double columns, and the poems follow in the same order: (1) "Ben Johnson to Burlace," (2) "Upon the King's Return to the City of London," (3)

¹¹ Reprinted in *Percy Society Reprints*, vol. 29. A fourth edition appeared in 1671. All trace of previous editions seems to be lost.

¹² Reprinted by G. Thorn-Drury (London, 1927).

"Venus Lachrymans," (4) "On the Death of Sir Tho. Pelham," (5) "Of Musick," (6) "The Catholick," (7) "A Song" ("When *Orpheus* sweetly did complain"), (8) "Love's Courtship" ("Hark my *Flora*, Love doth call us"). Of these, (3) and (8) are by William Cartwright, and (4), (5), and (7) have been ascribed to William Strode, while (7) had been included in the 1640 edition of Shakespeare's poems among "An Addition of some Excellent Poems, . . . By other Gentlemen." These likewise appear to have been popular drollery material, for (3) appeared in Playford's *Select Muscull Ayres and Dialogues* (1652) and *Wits Interpreter*; (5), in *Wit Restor'd*; (7), in *New Academy of Complements* (1669, 1684); and (8), in *Sportive Wit* (1656).

In addition to these four drolleries, it seems probable that Tonson made use of *New Court-Songs and Poems* (1672), although the evidence is less clear than in the other instances. To the fourth volume of the 1716 Miscellany were added three poems, identical versions of which appear in the earlier collection: "Love's Martyr" ("Alexis, instead of a Tear and a Kiss"), "Song" ("When first my free Heart was inspir'd by Desire"), and "Kisses, with an Addition" ("My Love and I for Kisses play'd"), the first stanza of which is by Strode. However, the order of the poems is different in the two collections, and they appear at widely scattered intervals in the Miscellany. Curiously enough, Tonson had previously printed the second poem in the 1704 edition of the fifth volume, but discarded this version, which is similar to those that had appeared in *Methinks the Poor Town Hath Suffered Too Long* (1673) and *Choyce Ayres* (1676), for the version in *New Court-Songs*. I have not been able to trace to a direct source the few remaining anonymous poems and ballads that were added to the Miscellany in 1716; but there is abundant evidence that most of these were highly popular as late as this date and that Tonson drew them from some of the late seventeenth-century drolleries, which have now become extremely difficult, if not impossible, to secure. Among the poems added to the third volume of the Miscellany, for instance, is "The Ballad of Tom and Will," which can be found in *Sportive Wit* (1656), *Merry Drollery*, and in at least three editions of *New Academy of Complements* (1669, 1670, and 1684). Two poems in the fourth volume, "Song of Hey ho" and "Harry and Moll," appeared in different versions in *Westminster*

Drollery. Of the additional poems in the sixth volume, "The lamentable Song of Lord Wigmore . . . and the fair Maid of Dunsmore" had already appeared in *Crowne-Garland of Goulde[n] Roses* (1659); "The Cavalier's Complaint" and its companion poem "An Eccho to the Cavalier's Complaint," in *Merry Drollery, Antidote Against Melancholy*, and *New Academy of Complements* (1669), and "In Praise of Ale," in *Wit and Drollery, Academy of Complements* (1650), and *Merry Drollery* Wither's "Shall I wasting in despair," also in the sixth volume, had become a popular song and had appeared as a broadside and in a large number of the miscellanies in different versions. Among the other added poems in this volume are "An old Ballad of Bold Robin Hood" and Heywood's "You little birds that sit and sing."

In his attempt to model the Miscellany partly on the late seventeenth-century anthologies in order to widen its appeal, Tonson turned also to the published works of many earlier poets—Tom Carew, Donne, Jonson, Corbet, Drayton, Suckling, and Marvel—and sandwiched selections from their works between more recent poems, again printing them in approximately the same order as they appeared in the collected works of these poets. With the exception of Drayton, these authors had been favorites in the early miscellanies; and the reputation of Drayton's shorter pieces, largely because of the popularity of his *Heroical Epistles*, had yet suffered little from neo-classic strictures. Indeed, Tonson could easily have learned of the popularity of these poets from the drolleries, to take but one instance, in *Parnassus Biceps* he must have noticed Corbet's "Journey into France," another version of which he printed from the collected edition of Corbet's works. Tonson's realization of the continued popularity of these poets is further evidenced by his edition in 1719 of Donne's collected poetry.

The 1716 edition of Dryden's Miscellany is not the only instance in which Tonson helps reveal the survival of a popular taste for things Elizabethan and Jacobean, for he took over, three years later, the publication of *Pills to Purge Melancholy*, which had remained popular since its first appearance in 1698. The 1719-1720 edition, which Tonson placed under the editorship of Tom D'Urfey, was, unlike the Miscellany, a song book, but it includes some Elizabethan pieces, such as Sir Edward Dyer's "My mind to me a kingdom is," and, in different versions, many songs and ballads that had been added in the 1716 Miscellany, such as "The Ballad of Tom and

Will," "Gilderoy," "Hunting the Hare," "A Maiden's Longing," "The Hobgoblin," "Sir Eglamore," "The Old Courtier," and Wither's "Shall I wasting in despair." Evidently Tonson found the inclusion of earlier poems and ballads profitable, for in 1727 he republished the 1716 Miscellany and retained all but two of the added poems. We cannot, therefore, assume that, because there are few comments on them, the pre-Restoration poems in the Miscellany attracted few readers. Tonson's recurrent interest in this field indicates otherwise; and the silence of the readers is no more remarkable than was their lack of comment on the material in the droleries.

We are not warranted in deducing from this survival a reactionary movement against neo-classicism; it indicates merely that neo-classicism had not yet penetrated all quarters, that the new, fashionable doctrines, however widely accepted, were still in advance of current reading tastes, that the pre-1716 editions of the Miscellany are representative of only a somewhat limited group, and that a market for the lyrics and ballads of the earlier miscellanies survived as late as 1727. The continuity of the survival into the first quarter of the eighteenth century of earlier poems and ballads is interesting, for it helps throw light on a hitherto rather neglected aspect of eighteenth-century reading tastes and has, perhaps, some bearing on the poetry of the period. But further study in the late seventeenth-century miscellanies and the duration of their popularity as revealed by reprints and by the commonplace books is necessary before we can have a well-rounded knowledge of this transitional period.

EARL R. WASSERMAN

The Johns Hopkins University

A MIDDLE ENGLISH PRAYER ROLL

Manuscript 486 of The Pierpont Morgan Library is an unusual roll manuscript consisting of three pieces of vellum nearly seven feet long and some six inches wide, probably executed in the north of England in the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century. Apart from the rather rough decorative work, the manuscript is of interest for its literary content which consists of three Latin prayers and

one in English, all of which are common in early Liturgical books, and a poem in English on the Passion, written in the form of the more famous "Fifteen Oes of Christ." This poem appears to be known in no other manuscript and is not listed in Professor Carleton Brown's *A Register of Middle English Religious & Didactic Verse* (Oxford, 1916-20). The prayers, which fill the first of the three strips of vellum, are the following:

I

Ave domina sancta Maria, mater Dei, regina celi, porta paradisi, domina mundi, lux sempiterna, imperatrix inferni, singularis et pura Tu es virgo, tu concepisti Jesum Cristum sine peccato, tu peperisti creatorem, redemptorem ac salvatorem mundi, in quo non dubito. Libera me ab omnibus malis et ora pro peccatis meis. Amen.¹

II

(S)it dulce nomen domini nostri Jhesu Cristi benedictum et nomen virginis Marie genetricis Dei in eternum et vltra Amen Jhesus Cristus.²

III

Ave Maria, alta stirps lilij castitatis. Aue profunda viola vallis humilitatis Aue lata rosa campi diuine charitatis. Aue abyssalis fons omnis gratie et misericordie celi ros fructifer omnis diuine suauitatis et deuotionis. Amen.³

IV

O mi souerayne lord Jhesu, the vary sone of all myghtye Gode and of þe moste cleyne & glorious virgyne Mary, that sufferede the bitter deth for

¹ Found, also, in the *Sarum Prymer* (Paris Thielmann Kerver, 1532—Morgan 1046), f. ccxxvii, recto. In a slightly different form, it occurs in the *Sarum Horae* (Paris: François Regnault, 25 May, 1536—Morgan 1035, Sign B₁₁ verso) with the note. "Our holy fader Sixtus the iiij. pope hath graunted to all them that deuoutly say this prayer before the ymage of our Lady the some of .xi. M. yers of perdon." This prayer may be found in still another form in manuscripts; compare MS. Lat. 14830, f. 84r, of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (*Hours for the use of Rouen*).

² Le pape Boniface à la prière du roy de France donna à touz ceulx qui dront dévotement ceste oraison .XX. ans de vroy pardon: Sit dulce nomen domini nostri Jhesu Xpisti benedictum. Et nomen uirginis Marie genetricisque eiusdem in eternum. Amen. (B. N., MS. Lat. 10528, f. 21r—*Hours for the use of Paris*).

³ This is found also in the *Sarum Prymer*, f. cxlvii, and in the *Sarum Horae*, f. xlv, with the note. "Our holy father Bonifacius pope of Rome hath graunted vnto all them that say deuoutly thys prayer. hondred days of pardon."

my saike & all mankynd vpon Goode Fryday & roose agayn the thride day. I beseche the, Lorde, to haue mercy vpon me that am a wretchede synner, but ȝit þi creatour, and for þi precyous passion, saue me and kepe me fro all perilles bodely and gostly, & specially from all thynges that myght torne to þi disspleasour. And with all my hait, I thanke the, moste mercyfull Lorde, for þi great mercyes þat thu has shewed me in the great daungers þat I haue beyn in, as well in my soull as in my body, & that þi grace & endlesse mercye haith euer kept me, spared me and sauede me fro the howre of my brikth into this tyme. I thanke the, Lorde, þat thi mercy may kepe me forth all way, & I cry þe mercye with all my hooll hart for my gret offences, for my great vnkyndnesse and for all my wretchede and synfull lyff. & þat I can not lead my liff as thi seruande, I crye the meicy for my trispasse. *Deus* ⁴

Though the poem which follows these prayers is of little poetic value, it can easily find its place in the corpus of Middle English religious pieces among poems of equal or lesser merit. It is clearly of northern origin as both dialectal and orthographic⁵ forms of North English or Scottish origin are found, for example *maike*, *wrayke*, *taike*, *stude*, *tuke*, *thrught*, *wett* and *qwhit* (in addition to those specially noted); the present participle, however, ends in *-yng*, pointing more towards North England than to Scotland itself. The poem is obviously not the work of a great poet; the metre is indifferent and the rhyme is poor.⁶ For the latter, we may note *place* : *was*, *the to* . *vnto*, *bee* . *dye*, and especially the doubtful *mercy* : *be-kenee* and the assonance in *swett* : *wepe*.

⁴ This prayer may be found, with only minor differences, in the *Prymer*, ff. CXXXIX (verso)—CCXL. It has the printed title: "A deuout prayer to Jesu chryst," and a manuscript note in the margin reads "ffor good ffriday." Through the courtesy of Dr. Jenkins and Miss Churchill, I have learned that the prayer is also found in the copy of the *Sarum Horae* (Westminster: Wynkyn de Worde, c. 1494, ff. 147-8) preserved in the Lambeth Palace Library, London.

⁵ The orthography may tell us little of the actual pronunciation of the words; so, for example in stanza VI, *be-holde* could hardly have been intended to be spoken with a decidedly round *o* as it is made to rhyme with *callde*. It was probably pronounced more like the northern *behold*. The same is true, no doubt, in stanza IV, when *strook* must stand for Scottish *straike* in order to make the rhyme.

⁶ The poem has been transcribed in the usual way, all contractions being expanded and italicized. Some erasures and corrections occur in the manuscript; these corrections have been noted by enclosing them in round brackets.

I

O Jhesu grant me þi will off wepynge
 Withe teris tricklyng vnto þi feett
 As thu ffand þi dyscypils slepynge
 At the mont off Olyuete
 Blud and watter thu dyde swett
 For dred of dethe fast dyde thu praye
 Ales! that cause shuld gae me wepe
 For my vnkyndnes nyght & daye

Pater noster aue Maria

II

O Jhesu than was thow full sone takyn
 At thi prayers wher thu wentt
 Thi seruandes son had the for-sakyn
 Be lyue the Juys thai had the hent
 Thai scorged the withe great toiment
 Thay band þe and brought þe to the towne
 Ales! I may full sore repent
 That myndes not off þi passionne

Pater noster aue Maria

III

That brought was into Caphus hall
 Withe fols accusyng in thei presens
 Wher great scornys thu sufferit all
 To preson thai put the as a thrall
 Wher thu stude bondyn all þe nyght
 Ales! what ruth shall me be-fall
 That had no ruthe to se þat sight

Pater noster aue Maria

IV

O Jhesu in the mornyng may we see
 þu gud throught þe stret wth many strok
 To Pilot petuesly brogt thay thee
 And fols accusyng many did maik
 And Pilot saw how all thair wrayk
 Was by inuy to haue the slayne
 And ȝit ales! no thought I taye
 What passion þu sufferit for my syne

Pater noster aue Maria

V

O Jhesu Pilot sent the thene
 To Herot kyng throught out þe stret
 Thai left on þe their cursit mene

The myer þat layde vnder þer feett
Kyng Herot as a fowll þe lede
And sent the agayne all clede in qwhit
Ales! Jhesu thy bodye swett
For me þu sufferit great dyspitt

Pater noster aue Maria

VI

O Jhesu now may we be-holde
The pepill cryed to haue þe dede
And Pilot to his cownsell calde
And dampnyt þe ther in that stede
Fro þi bare þu turned thi hede
As who drawith thaym to þer dome
Ales! þai gart thi body blede
For our saluacion that þeder come

Pater noster aue Maria

VII

O Jhesu than was thu turned nakitt
Thy fair body for to be bett
For dred of deth þi flesche it whakit
Thay layd on the with scorgis gret
That þi blud ran down vnto þi feet
For euery stroke raf skyne & flesche
Ales! I maye my chekes weitt
That hathe no ruthe of þi anguysses

Pater noster aue Maria

VIII

O Jhesu than cled þai the in a mantill of paull
And croned þe with thornys keyne
To þi brayn brast withe all
Thi blud rane on the eyne
Ales! thai tuke it all in teyne
Thay set a crosse in-to thi hande
And scorned the all be deyne
And said haill kyng of Juys land

Pater noster aue Maria

IX

O Jhesu than was þu rassed be lyff
So hard thai pullit þi mantill þe fro
Than skyne & flesche be-gane to riff
So hard it cleuit þi body vnto
A-bowt thi dethe fast dyd þai goo
A crosse thay gart ly on þi backe

Thay let it foll vppon the soo
 That ner þi shulder all to bracke
 Pater noster aue Mar[ia]

X

O Jhesu now may I rayr & morne
 To se þi payns þat was so gret
 When þu saw thy mother come
 She fell in swonyng at þi feet
 Then wom^{en} gane þer chekes wett
 And thu sayd perse woman wep not see me
 And for fayntnes failled þi feett
 Ales! thay fell down with þe crose on thee
 Pater noster aue Ma[ria]

XI

O Jhesu nowe may we ssee asse
 þai gart þe go agayn þi myȝt
 Thay gart on bere the crosse
 Symonde seruand þat he heght
 When thai com at þe hill of hight
 With hedyous payns þai turned þe nakit
 Ales! it was a rewoffull syght
 To se thi body as it whakyt
 Pater noster aue Ma[ria]

XII

O Jhesu than thi mothere rane
 And say the naylit & cryet ales
 Thruȝ hir presse she to þe wane
 Emonges all people that there was
 Then swonyt she thrise in þat place
 For sorow þu myȝt not spek herto
 And that to þe more sorow was
 Then all befor þat thay cuthe doo
 Pater noster aue Ma[ria]

XIII

O Jhesu strong was thy bandes
 Vppon a cros when þai kest the
 Thay pullit þi rops þi feet þi handes
 Nailed þe hard vnto a tree
 That ilk a synfull man mayȝt see
 Thi blude ryne down on stremys red
 Ales! Jhesu what aylis mee
 To haue no pitye off þi dede
 Pater noster aue Ma[ria]

XIV

O Jhesu than left thai vp the tree
 Thai rogit þi body heder & theder
 To all thy synnis brast in þe
 Thi blude þu blede all to-githere
 Thu askit a drynk & þai wer leder
 A bitter draught þai brozt the to
 Ales! þu be-gane to whak & wheder
 The thirst it went þi hart vnto
 Pater noster aue Ma[ria]

XV

O Jhesu nowe may I see (howe)
 A full sharp sper (went) to þi hart
 For loue of me þi goste (gave thowe)
 Thi father dere & dyet with (smarte)
 Lord Jhesu I praye to the
 That þu wolde here my oracioun
 And grant me grace (with the to be
 In ioie and blisse there for to wone)

Envoy

(Lord Jhesu blessedde may thowe bee)
 With honore & ioie & all lovyng
 That wold be mane & for vs dye
 Lorde Jhesu grant me goode endyng
 Mercy Jhesu and grant mercy
 for bodey & sawll I the be-kenee
 In nomine patris et filij et spiritus sancti
 amen: Pater noster aue Maria: credo in Deum.

IHS

GLOSSARY

- I, 3. ffind—past tense of find; largely Scottish in XV century.
 7. gare—gar = make, do, perform; chiefly Scottish and Northern,
 used a number of times.
 II, 6. band—past tense of bind; largely Northern.
 III, 6. stude—past tense of stand; Scottish and Northern.
 IV, 2. gud—form of yode (NED); used by Barbour and Dunbar.
 5. wrayk—Scottish form of wrake = active enmity.
 V, 3. mene—mean = complaint.
 VI, 5. bare—figurative sense of bare or bier? ?
 VII, 3. whakit—Scottish form of quaked.
 6. raf—past tense of rive = lacerate; Scottish form.

- VIII, 1. pall—Scottish form of pall = rich cloth, or as OE, purple cloth?
 3. brast—"northern form of Burst" (NED).
 5. teyne—Scottish form of teen = malice
 7. deyne—dain = disdain.
- IX, 1. rasséd—rase (NED, verb 1) or race (NED, verb 4)?
 3. riff—Scottish form of infinitive, rive
 8. bracke—Scottish form, from break
- X, 1. rayr—roar = cry with despair, used by Barbour and Douglas.
- XI, 1. asse—for else?
- XII, 2 say—past tense of see.
 3. wane—past tense of win = to make one's way; chiefly Scottish and Northern in this sense
- XIV, 1. left—past tense of lift.
 2. rogit—past tense of rog = to shake.
 5. leder—lither = wicked, base.
 7. whak & wheder—quake and wither.
- XV, 8 wone = dwell; chiefly Northern
- Envoy, 6 be-kenee—beken = commend A form specially created so as to make the rhyme bekenee mercyè.? ?

CURT F. BÜHLER

*The Pierpont Morgan Library,
 New York City
 New York*

LA DATE DE L'ORAISON DE L'ÂME FIDÈLE ET SON IMPORTANCE POUR LA BIOGRAPHIE MORALE DE MARGUERITE DE NAVARRE

La question de la pensée de Marguerite de Navarre est encore loin d'être résolue. Tour à tour on a cru reconnaître en elle une fervente de Platon à tendance protestante,¹ une mystique panthéiste,² un disciple des libertins spirituels³ et une luthérienne.⁴ A

¹ Voir Lefranc, A., *Les idées religieuses de Marguerite de Navarre d'après son œuvre poétique*, dans *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme français*, années 1897-98; *Marguerite de Navarre et le Platonisme de la Renaissance*, dans *Grands Ecrivains français de la Renaissance*, Paris, 1914. Moench, W., *Die italienische Platonrenaissance und ihre Bedeutung für Frankreichs Literatur- und Geistesgeschichte (1450-1550)*, Berlin, 1936, pp. 311-339.

² Parturier, E., *Les sources du mysticisme de Marguerite de Navarre*, dans *Revue de la Renaissance*, v (1904), 1 et 49.

³ Brunetière, F., *Histoire de la Littérature française classique*, I, 168 sqq. Busson, H., *Du Rationalisme dans la Littérature française de la*

l'appui de ces diverses thèses, on n'a éprouvé aucune peine à trouver dans les ouvrages de la reine nombre de passages convaincants. Cependant, il s'agit non seulement de savoir quelle est l'idée prédominante de ces œuvres mais de se demander s'il n'y a peut-être pas eu évolution.

Evidemment, ce n'est que lorsqu'on aura définitivement établi la chronologie des œuvres de Marguerite qu'on pourra se vanter d'avoir résolu le problème. Ph. Aug. Becker et Pierre Jourda se sont mis à cette tâche, mais leurs résultats demandent encore à être complétés.⁵ Ce qu'il y a d'étonnant dans le travail considérable de ce dernier, c'est que la masse des faits n'ait pas permis de tirer des conséquences plus positives sur la pensée de la reine. En ce qui concerne au moins un des poèmes, l'*Oraison de l'Âme fidèle*, nous croyons que si Jourda avait appliqué là le procédé de Becker sans préjugé, comme il l'a fait pour d'autres de moindre intérêt, il aurait découvert que ce poème ne date pas de 1527-1530, mais bien de 1540-1547.⁶ La manière dont on parvient à établir cette date, ainsi que les renseignements qui en découlent, constituent le sujet du présent article.

Dans les œuvres de la première période, c'est-à-dire jusqu'à la publication du *Mirour de l'Âme pécheresse* (1531), on trouve surtout les idées de ceux qu'on a appelés évangéliques ou réformistes et qui formèrent le cénacle de Meaux.⁷ Ces idées se rattachent

Renaissance (1533-1601), Paris, 1922 (Chap. X: *Les Libertins spirituels*, p. 315).

⁵ Moore, W. G., *La Réforme allemande et la Littérature française*, Strasbourg, 1930 (Chap. VIII: Les grands esprits: Marot et Marguerite, p. 178). Renaudet, A., *Marguerite de Navarre (à propos d'un ouvrage récent)*, dans *RSS*, XVIII (1931), 272-308.

⁶ Becker, Ph. A., *Jugendgeschichte Margareta's aus einer Wiener Handschrift*, dans *ASNS*, CXXXI (1913), 334-347. Jourda, P., *Marguerite d'Angoulême*, Paris, 1930.

⁷ "Nous croyons . . . que l'on pourra, sans crainte d'erreurs, admettre que le *Mirour* et l'*Oraison de l'Âme fidèle* sont postérieurs à 1525. Comme les événements de 1525-27 ont interrompu la production de Marguerite, ces deux poèmes auraient donc été composés entre 1527 et 1531." Jourda, *op cit.*, p. 1109. (On trouvera le texte de l'*Oraison* dans l'édition des *Marguerites* publiée par Félix Frank, Paris, 1873, I, 76-132)

⁷ Becker, Ph. A., *Marguerite, duchesse d'Alençon, et Guillaume Briçonnet, évêque de Meaux, d'après leur correspondance inédite (1521-1524)*, dans *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme français*, année 1900, pp. 393-477 et 661-667; *Les idées religieuses de G. Briçonnet, évêque de*

étroitement à celles de Luther : justification par la foi, liberté vis-à-vis de la Loi (excepté du Décalogue), référence constante aux Saintes Ecritures (surtout aux Epîtres de Paul), duel de l'esprit et de la chair, etc. On retrouve tout cela dans le *Dialogue en forme de vision nocturne* et dans le *Miroir*. En outre, tout comme le Luther des débuts, Marguerite a des élans de mysticisme, mais telle n'est nullement la note dominante des œuvres qu'elle a composées avant 1531, à moins qu'on n'étende démesurément la notion de mysticisme. Jusqu'à cette date la foi et l'Ecriture constituent sa pensée directrice; il n'est encore nullement question de la folie et de la fausseté du *cuyder*.

Pourtant l'un des poèmes qu'on croit être de cette période se distingue nettement des autres par le ton; en un mot, l'idée de *cuyder* y fait son apparition. C'est l'*Oraison de l'Ame fidèle*, qui ne fut publiée qu'en 1547 dans le recueil des *Marguerites*. La raison pour laquelle Jourda suppose qu'il remonte aux premières années créatrices de la reine, c'est apparemment qu'il fut imprimé avec les *Marguerites* plutôt qu'avec la *Suite des Marguerites*.⁸ En réalité et comme l'indique déjà la date de publication, cette *Oraison* appartient à une période ultérieure qui va approximativement de 1540 à 1547. C'est ce que nous allons essayer de démontrer.

Tout d'abord, l'*Oraison* reproduit exactement l'état d'âme qui fut celui de Marguerite à cette époque, tel que nous le connaissons d'après les poèmes dont on croit avoir établi la date avec certitude (par exemple, la *Fable du Faux Cuyder*, le *Triomphe de l'Agneau*, la *Coche*). Après la mort de François Ier, la tendance mystique qui commence vers 1540 devient encore plus marquée et nous avons le *Navire* et les *Prisons*, sans parler des *Chansons spirituelles* dont les premières remontent peut-être à la date ci-dessus. En effet, durant les dix dernières années de sa vie, Marguerite a cessé d'être un simple disciple des évangéliques. Elle néglige maintenant de se reporter fidèlement à l'Ecriture; les renvois fréquents qu'elle y faisait autrefois ont presque disparu. Elle a dépassé Calvin, car elle pousse l'amour de Dieu jusqu'à l'extrême limite de la liberté, c'est-à-dire qu'elle se refuse à reconnaître que le péché

Meaux, dans *Revue de Théologie et des Questions religieuses*, année 1900, pp. 318 et 377.

⁸ Jourda, *op. cit.*, pp. 1122-1124 (*Hypothèse relative aux Marguerites et aux Dernières Poésies*).

existe pour celui qui est pénétré de cet amour. Ce qui ressort tout particulièrement des écrits de la dernière époque, c'est non seulement le néant de la créature (antithèse du Tout et du Rien, qu'elle exprime déjà à ses débuts et qui, probablement par Brignonnet, remonte à Tauler et à Suso⁹), mais la haine du *cuyder* ou raison humaine, obstacle au bonheur et même source de tout mal. Il faut insister sur les faits suivants : 1^o cette dernière idée n'apparaît dans aucun des poèmes de jeunesse, mais elle est exprimée avec force dans presque tous les poèmes écrits à partir de 1540, y compris *l'Oraison de l'Âme fidèle*, 2^o cette attitude envers le *cuyder* est le trait le plus caractéristique des *libertins spirituels*.¹⁰

Deux conséquences naturelles de cet état d'esprit sont l'abandon de l'activité intellectuelle visant à l'érudition et l'indifférence vis-à-vis de la moralité conventionnelle et des églises "visibles." La seconde aide à comprendre pourquoi Marguerite n'a jamais éprouvé le besoin de renoncer ouvertement au catholicisme et aussi pourquoi elle a composé avec tant de candeur les anecdotes scabreuses qui couvrent nombre de pages de *l'Heptaméron*. Quant à la première, vu la manière dont la reine a encouragé les humanistes et les traducteurs, elle surprend plutôt. Néanmoins, dans les *Prisons*, Marguerite déclare expressément qu'à un moment donné elle fut saisie d'un dégoût profond envers les livres, qui constituaient sa dernière "prison."¹¹

⁹ Voir Parturier, *op. cit.*

¹⁰ Voir les traités de Calvin *Contre la secte . . . des libertins . . . spirituels* (1545) et *Contre un certain cordelier . . . supposit de la secte des libertins* (1547). Cf. "La nature humaine et le monde visible ne sont en eux-mêmes que des phénomènes sans consistance; mais l'homme s'attribue ainsi qu'au monde qui l'environne une existence réelle et autonome: illusion funeste, qui tient à l'imperfection de sa nature, et dont le siège est sa pensée défectueuse, ou, suivant l'expression favorite des libertins, le *cuyder*" (Jundt, A., *Histoire du Panthéisme populaire au Moyen Âge et au seizième siècle*, Paris, 1875, p. 137.)

¹¹ *Dernières poésies de Marguerite de Navarre*, publiées par A. Lefranc, Paris, 1896, p. 185 sqq. Entre beaucoup d'autres, les vers suivants sont significatifs :

Bien longuement ceste lutte dura
Entre nous deux, dont mon cuer endura,
Par mainte année et longue experience,
Par maint tourment et maint impassience,
Tant de douleurs, qu'à la fin se rendit,
Quand dans ce feu une voix entendit.

Une lettre du réformateur Bucer à la reine laisse entrevoir qu'en 1538 celle-ci était déjà au courant des idées de la secte des *libertins spirituels*.¹² Vers cette date, deux des chefs du mouvement, Pocque et Quintin, furent reçus à Nérac où ils devinrent pour un temps les "serviteurs" de la reine.¹³ Lorsque Calvin lança son *Trakté contre la secte phantastique et fureuse des Libertins qui se nomment spirituels* (1545), elle prit si vigoureusement leur défense que le réformateur genevois se sentit obligé de se justifier.¹⁴ Bien que Quintin ait été mis à mort l'année suivante à Tournay, rien ne prouve que Pocque ne soit pas demeuré auprès de la reine.¹⁵

Mais la preuve concrète que l'*Oraison* a été composée assez tard se trouve dans la versification. D'après la table qui suit (et qui est due en partie à Becker), on constatera que jusque vers 1527 le poète employait volontiers l'ancienne césure féminine dite *lyrique*, du type suivant:

O Nature (4 syllabes) *où est vostre défense?* (6 syllabes)

et qu'elle ignorait presque totalement la césure moderne avec élision, conforme à l'exemple suivant:

Grâce pour grâce (4 syllabes) *et plus leurs cœurs s'abaissent* (6 syllabes)

Si on lit ces deux vers à haute voix, on se rendra compte du défaut

C'est ceste voix qui au buysson ardent
Fist au pasteur, qui estoit attendant,
De son saint nom la vérité sçavoir.
"Je suys qui suys qu'œil vivant ne peult veoir"
Ceste voix là, ceste parolle vive,
Où nostre chair ne congnoist fondz ne rive,
Me print, tua et changea si soudain
Que je perdis mon cuyder faulx et vain. (pp. 202-203)

¹² Reproduite dans *Calvin Opera*, t. VII, *prolegomena*, p. XXI

¹³ D'après l'*Histoire ecclésiastique des églises réformées*, ed. Baum et Cunitz, Paris, 1883-1889, I, 37. Il y a un Antoine Pocque aumônier de Jeanne d'Albret dès 1539. Cf. Lefranc et Boulenger, *Comptes de L. de Savoie et de M. d'Angoulême*, Paris, 1905 (Cité par Jourda, *op. cit.*, p. 306, note).

¹⁴ Cette riposte de Calvin peut se lire dans Bonnet, J., *Lettres de Jean Calvin. Lettres françaises*. Paris, 1854, I, 111-117.

¹⁵ En 1548 le même Antoine Pocque figure encore sur la liste de sa maison en qualité d'aumônier. Cf. La Ferrière-Percy, H. de la, *Marguerite d'Angoulême, sœur de François Ier, son livre de dépenses (1540-1549)*, p. 178. Paris, 1862.

du premier, dans lequel on est obligé d'accentuer l'*e* muet du mot *nature*, afin de compléter l'hémistiche.

Poème	Date de composition	Nombre de vers	Nombre de césures lyriques	Nombre de c. par élision
Oraison à N S J C..	1527	219	36	1
Pater Noster .	1527	290	59	3
Dialogue en forme de vision nocturne.	1527	1293	175	3
Miroir de l'Âme péche- resse .	1531	1434	74	40
La Coche	1540	1299	3	40
Oraison de l'Âme fidèle	?	1800	3	68
Fable .	1540-47	815	0	21
Triomphe de l'Agneau	1540-47	1623	0	16

Comme en témoigne le *Miroir*, vers 1530 Marguerite fait un premier effort pour améliorer la forme de ses vers; en effet, si on y découvre encore 74 césures lyriques, le nombre de celles avec élision est monté à 40. N'oublions pas que c'est à ce moment-là que Marot prépare son *Adolescence clémentine*, dans la préface de laquelle il formule des préceptes se rapportant à la coupe féminine.¹⁶ Il semble inadmissible que Marguerite n'ait pas demandé quelques conseils à son protégé.

Quoi qu'il en soit, à partir de 1540, elle évite avec un soin extrême l'emploi de l'ancienne césure. Or, comme sur 1800 vers l'*Oraison* ne contient que trois cas de césure lyrique, on ne peut faire autrement que de la placer à côté de la *Coche*, de la *Fable du Faux Cuyder* et du *Triomphe de l'Agneau*, dont la proportion est analogue. En tout cas, il n'y a aucun doute qu'elle a été composée plus tard que le *Miroir*.

En résumé, puisque cette double analyse de fond et de forme donne des résultats identiques, il semble qu'il impose de faire une correction à la chronologie acceptée jusqu'ici et d'attribuer à

¹⁶ Cf. *Œuvres de Marot*, éd. Guiffrey, II, 15. Il est vrai que ce terme désigne plutôt la césure dite épique, que Marot avait employée dans ses toutes premières œuvres et à laquelle il avait décidé de renoncer. Mais, comme le dit Kastner, la césure lyrique, qu'on trouve encore au début du XVI^e siècle, notamment dans les œuvres de Gringore et de Jean Marot, perd rapidement du terrain, et on n'en découvre pas un seul cas chez Clément. C'est par conséquent à lui que doit revenir le mérite d'avoir rejeté systématiquement ce vestige d'une époque lyrique primitive. (Voir Kastner, L. E., *A History of French Versification*, Oxford, 1903, p. 88.)

l'Oraison la date 1540-1546. Loin d'entraîner des complications, cette attribution permet de caractériser plus clairement deux des périodes créatrices de Marguerite et confirme une hypothèse avancée par certains chercheurs.¹⁷

EDWARD F. MEYLAN

University of California

A CHAUCER ALLUSION

An apparently unnoticed allusion to Chaucer occurs in John Norden's *Labyrinth of Man's Life or Virtues Delight and Ennuies opposite* printed in 1614 and dedicated to Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset. In "The Author's farewell to his Booke" Norden pays homage to Chaucer, Gower and Gavin Douglas, eloquent poets in ages past, and then to Sidney and Spenser. These tributes are the more interesting because Norden at the same time mentions the difficulty which the contemporary reader has in deciphering Chaucer's "ambiguous phrases" although he knows that in Chaucer's day the poem was written in the vulgar tongue. Norden's chief complaint is lodged against contemporary poets who beset their poems with "Chaucer's words and phrases ancient," terms which demanded *comentation* to enable the reader to understand the matter.

THE AUTHOR'S FAREWELL TO HIS BOOKE

Chawcer, Gower, the bishop of Dunkell
In ages farre remote were eloquent:
Now *Sidney, Spencer*, others moe excell,
And are in latter times more excellent,
To antique *Laureats* parallel.¹

¹⁷ Brunetière (*op. cit.*) et Busson (*op. cit.*) insistent sur le rapprochement qu'il impose de faire entre Marguerite et les libertins spirituels mais n'envisagent pas d'évolution. Au contraire, Renaudet (*op. cit.*) est persuadé qu'il faut diviser la vie du poète en périodes, mais il n'établit pas de distinction foncière entre la toute première (avant 1527) et la dernière (après 1540), car il croit que le mysticisme à tendance luthérienne manifesté par Marguerite pendant sa jeunesse se réveille vers la fin de sa vie, sans autres changements sensibles que ceux résultant de la maturité.

¹ This stanza is quoted as a Spenser allusion in C. L. Powell's *English Domestic Relations*, p. 191.

But matters of great admiration,
 In moderne *Poesies* are wordes estrang'd
 Invention of hid speculation
 The scope whereof hardly conceiv' as it is rang'd
 But by a *comentation*.

Who readeth *Chaucer* as a *Modern man*
 Not looking back into the time he wrote,
 Will hardly his ambiguous *phrases* scan,
 Which in that time were vulgar, well I wote
 Yet we run back where he began

And all our praised *Poems* art beset,
 With *Chaucers* wordes and Phrases ancient
 Which these our *Moderne* ages quite forget
 Yet in their *Poems* far more Eloquent
 Not yet from *Gowre* or *Chaucer* fett

Why should it not befit our *Poets* well,
 To use the wordes and *Phrases* *Vulgar* know?
 Why should they rouse them from oblivions cel
 Sith their ambiguous termes frō whence they flow
 The learned'st Reader scant can tell

But thinges illustrated with art and sence,
 As *Chaucer* did his *Troylus* and *Creside*.
 To amplifi't aptly with *Eloquence*
 Base matter by good *Verse* is beautifi'de,
 And gaines admired *Reverence*.

Not using *wordes* and *phrases* all so darke
 But so familiarly as *vulgar* may,
 Will apprehend the Poets couched marke
 And seeth' *Idea* which he doth display:
 About the *Center* in his *Arke*

Was Norden criticizing the metaphysical poets? Perhaps he felt with Ben Jonson that Spenser writ no language. Norden says, however, that the highest type of poetry combines art and sense as Chaucer's *Troylus* and *Creside* abundantly illustrates, and base matter is always raised by good verse to a place of admiration. Norden himself would write in the *Labyrinth of Man's Mind*, a poem easily understood in which the idea is of central importance. This Chaucer allusion owes its interest to the praise which an early seventeenth century poet bestowed on Chaucer, Gower, Douglas, Sidney and Spenser; to his criticism of the contemporary poets

who conceal their ideas in the ambiguous phrases of another age, and to his own feeling that art and sense are required to elevate the poets matter.

KATHRINE KOLLER

Bryn Mawr College

CHAUCER'S *TAILLYNGE YNOUGH*.

It is unfortunate that Dr. Robinson, in his edition of Chaucer, has not completely glossed the vulgar, but extremely pertinent, pun which ends the Shipman's Tale. In l. 416, the wife says, of the money which she has spent, "score it upon my taille." Dr. Robinson gives the meaning "'Score it upon my tally'; charge it to my account." It is probable, however, that there is a pun here. In Farmer and Henly's *Dictionary*, *tail* is given as having the meaning "the female *pudendum*." In view of the situation of the wife and her husband at the time when she makes this remark, it is appropriate in its slang meaning.

In the last lines of the story, the Shipman says ". . . God us sende/Taillynge ynough unto oure lyves ende. Amen." Dr. Robinson notes, "Here, as in many of the Tales, the final blessing is adapted to the story which precedes," and cites passages from *WBProI* which show that he is aware of the possibility of vulgarity. It is unfortunate, however, that he does not note that at present, and possibly in Chaucer's day, *tailng* has the meaning of "sexual intercourse."

CLAUDE JONES

University of California at Los Angeles

THE MONK'S TALE, A MEDIAEVAL SERMON

Because of the peculiar order in which sermon elements appear in the Monk's Tale, and the bareness of the examples, scholars do not seem to have considered it in the light of a sermon at all. Yet it accords with the description of the monastic sermon that is given by Mr. G. R. Owst in his *Preaching in mediaeval England*.¹ Of the convent library, he says:

¹ Cambridge, 1926.

. . . in the convent library, as contrasted with the homes of the secular clergy, lay ready for . . . daily use a comparatively rich selection of earlier homilies, expositions, "exemplaria," and the like, with all the added sanctity of age and reputation upon them.²

Such "exemplaria" form the body of the Monk's Tale. Mr. Owst's description of the monastic sermon is as follows:

The dullness as well as the scarceness of the monastic sermon of the period has already been noted elsewhere; and so far as we can judge from what remains, it is a pulpit that suggests something of the cloister stagnation as well as a cloister calm.³

That this was the effect of the Monk's "tragedies" on his hearers is borne out by the comments of the Knight, who cuts him short, and the Host.

It is interesting to note that the usual elements of the sermon are present, though not in the usual order. The theme is given in his definition of tragedy, which he says concerns

. . . hym that stood in greet prosperitee,
And is yfallen out of heigh degree
Into myserie, and endeth wrecchedly. (ll. 1975-7)

The protheme apology begins with line 1984 and ends with "Have me excused of myn ignoraunce." (l. 1990) This is followed by a full restatement of the theme (ll. 1191-8) which ends with the moral

Lat no man truste on blynde prosperitee;
Be war by thise ensamples trewe and olde.

Then come the "exemplaria," sixteen in number, liberally spiced with such warnings as the following:

Lo, who may truste on Fortune any throwe?
For hym that folweth al this world of prees,
Er he be war, is ofte yleyd ful lowe (ll. 2136-8)
. . . whan Fortune wole a man forsake,
She bereth away his regne and his richesse,
And eek his freendes, bothe moore and lesse. (ll. 2241-3)
Thus kan Fortune hir wheel governe and gye,
And out of joye brynge men to sorwe. (ll. 2397-8)

Despite the fact that the Monk is interrupted, he gives a complete redaction of his definition of tragedy, and his warning against Fortune:

² P. 50.

³ P. 255.

Tragedies noon oother maner thyng
 Ne kan in syngyng crie ne biwaille
 But that Fortune alwey wole assaille
 With unwar strook the regnes that been proude;
 For whan men trusteth hire, thanne wol she faille,
 And covere hire brighte face with a clowde. (ll 2761-6)

This seems to indicate that the Monk was finished, although the Knight is evidently unaware of this, as is the Host.

CLAUDE JONES

University of California at Los Angeles

THE DATE OF SKELTON'S *BOWGE OF COURT*

In spite of the fact that scholars have placed the date of Skelton's *Bowge of Court* anywhere from 1499 to 1521, the poem was actually in print by 1500, probably in the year 1499. The wide range of date into which speculation has led scholars is explained by the fact that the *Bowge of Court*, like all the other early copies of Skelton's work with the exception of the *Garland of Laurel*, bears no date on its titlepage; hence any conclusions as to when it was published have rested on a number of hypotheses. Herford put the date of the poem within a dozen years after 1509.¹ He arrived at this period by assuming that the *Bowge of Court* unmistakably showed the influence of Barclay's *Ship of Fools*, a translation of Brandt's *Narrenschiff* published in 1509; he reached the other limit by assuming that the *Bowge* must have been written before the period of Skelton's attacks against Wolsey. Rey² and Koelbing³ agreed with Herford. Brie came closest to the truth.⁴ He argued that since Barclay's *Ship of Fools* was merely a translation of a work known in England for some years previously through Locher's

¹ Charles H. Herford, *Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century*, Cambridge, 1886, p. 351.

² Albert Rey, *Skelton's Satirical Poems in their Relation to Lydgate's Order of Fools*, etc., Bern, 1899, p. 51.

³ A. Koelbing, *Zur Charakteristik John Skelton's*, Freiburg, 1904, p. 69. In his chapter in the *Cambridge History of English Literature* on Barclay and Skelton, written after Brie's studies, Koelbing modifies his position

⁴ Friedrich Brie, "Skelton-studien," *Englische Studien*, xxxvii, 40-41.

Latin translation in 1497, Skelton might well have been familiar with the *Narrenschiff* at any time after that date. But he is inclined to discount the influence of the *Narrenschiff* altogether, and on internal evidence place the *Bowge of Court* between 1499 and 1503, during which time Skelton is generally supposed to have been at court as Prince Henry's tutor. Berdan follows Brie in believing that the poem is a very early work, and goes a bit further in suggesting the possibility that the *Bowge of Court* was Skelton's explanation of his retirement to Diss, as a refuge from a court in which he found nothing good.⁵

The poem, as I have said, was originally printed before 1500. There are two copies extant, one in the Advocates Library in Edinburgh, the other in the University Library at Cambridge. Both are undated, and both are printed by Wynkyn de Worde. The colophon of the Advocates copy reads, "Thus endeth the Bowge of courte. / Enprynted at westmynster By me / Wynkyn the worde. /" The colophon of the Cambridge copy reads "Thus endeth the Bowge of courte Enprynted at London by Wynkyn de Worde in flete strete, at the sygne of the sonne. /" Sometime in 1500, Wynkyn de Worde moved from Westminster to Fleet St. and never returned.⁶ Therefore any book printed by de Worde at Westminster must have been issued during or before 1500. There are two reasons for believing the *Bowge* to have been printed in 1499. The type used in this copy is de Worde's No. 4, 95 mm, a type which he is known to have used for the first time in 1499. Furthermore there are 29 lines to a page, which was characteristic of the majority of books published in that year.⁷ The copy at Cambridge is a later reprint of the Advocates copy.

Obviously this date disposes of any connection between Skelton's poem and Barclay's *Ship of Fools*. If dissatisfaction with court life sent Skelton to Diss by 1504, it was at least no sudden distaste, since he remained as part of the court for some years after he had written the *Bowge*.⁸ If, as has been generally supposed, he became Prince Henry's tutor in 1498, then we might assume that a newly

⁵ John M. Berdan, *Early Tudor Poetry*, New York, 1920, pp. 100-101.

⁶ E. Gordon Duff, *Early Printed Books*, London, 1893, p. 141.

⁷ E. Gordon Duff, *Early English Printing*, London, 1896, pp. 6-8.

⁸ His Latin treatise to Prince Henry is dated Eltham, 1501. See F. M. Salter, "Skelton's *Speculum Principis*," *Speculum*, 1934, ix, 36.

acquired knowledge of court life from first hand observation might have provoked him to write his satire. But recently a scholar has suggested with sound reasoning that Skelton may have been part of the court as early as 1489, in which case there would be no more reason to publish such a poem in 1499 than in any of the ten years preceding.⁹ I am inclined to believe that however long Skelton had been attached to the court, the impetus for the poem was furnished by Locher's Latin translation of the *Narrenschiff* in 1497. Since there is no evidence that Skelton knew German, he probably would not have been familiar with the original, published in 1494. But the Latin translation had gone into three editions in Germany and two in France by 1498. If he did read Locher, it was not the whole poem but only a small portion, the chapter on flattery and the vice of courtiers, that furnished the structural idea from which he evolved the *Bowge of Court*.

HELEN STEARNS SALE

Ithaca, N Y.

SPENSER AND GOSSON

Stephen Gosson's dedication of *The Schoole of Abuse* to Master, afterwards Sir Philip Sidney, occasioned some comment from Spenser which is puzzling when further facts are revealed. On the 16th of October 1579 Spenser wrote to Harvey:

Newe Bookes I heare of none, but only of one, that writing a certaine Booke, called *The Schoole of Abuse*, and dedicating it to Maister Sidney, was for hys labor scorned: if at leaste it be in the goodnesse of that nature to scorne Such folhe is it, not to regarde aforehande the inclination and qualitie of him, to whom we dedicate oure Bookes.¹

Gosson apparently made his dedication without having asked Sidney about it. Spenser assumed that Gosson was looking for patronage, and himself, extremely sensitive to all the issues of dedication, for he had only lately published his *Calender*, suing likewise for Sidney's favour, could not fail to be taken by what seemed an indelicacy on Gosson's part.

The question becomes complicated when we find that Gosson dedi-

⁹ *Loc. cit.*, pp. 31-33.

¹ *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, ed. G. Gregory Smith, I, 89.

cated his *Ephemerides of Phialo*, published in the fall of 1579, some months after the publication of *The Schoole of Abuse*, also to Sidney in these words:

. . . And sith it hath beene my fortune to heare sayle in a storme, since my first publishing the *Schoole of Abuse*, and too bee tossed by such as forme without reason, and threaten me death without a cause, feeling not yet my finger ake, I can not but acknowledge my safetie, in your Worships patronage, and offer you *Phialo* my chiefest luel, as a manifest pledge of my thankfull heart.²

This dedication shows either that Sidney had not "scorned" Gosson's book, or that Gosson was insensible to Sidney's contempt. Gosson had gone into the country after issuing *The Schoole of Abuse*,³ and may not have known of Sidney's censure, for censure it seems to have been, as evidenced by the *Defense*:

And yet I must say, that as I have just cause to make a pitiful defense of poor poetry, which from almost the highest estimation of learning is fallen to be the laughing-stock of children, so have I need to bring some more available proofs, since the former is by no man barred of his deserved credit, the silly latter hath had even the names of philosophers used to the defacing of it, with great danger of civil war among the Muses. And first, truly, to all them that, professing learning, inveigh against poetry, may justly be objected that they go very near to ungratefulness, to seek to deface that which, in noblest nations and languages that are known, hath been the first light-giver to ignorance . . .

There was no other popular abuse of poetry in existence up to the time of Sidney's death, and the allusion to those professing learning points to Gosson. But the second edition of *The Schoole of Abuse*, in 1587, retained the original dedication.⁵ Sidney, of course, was not living at this time. Spenser's letters appeared in print about the middle of 1580, and Sidney's *Defense of Poesy* was written, presumably, sometime between 1581 and 1583, though not published until 1595. The first of these must have been known to Gosson, and it is more than likely that the *Defense* was known to him from hear-

² *The Ephemerides of Phialo*, London, 1579. The Epistle Dedicatorie

³ *Playes Confuted in Five Actions*, in *The English Drama and Stage under the Tudor and Stuart Princes*, Roxburghe Library, 1869, p. 217. Also "Editor's Introduction" to *The Schoole of Abuse*, English Reprints, ed. Edward Arber, p. 5.

⁴ Philip Sidney, *The Defense of Poesy*, ed. A. S. Cook, p. 2.

⁵ Bernard Quaritch, *A Catalogue of Books in English History and Literature*, London, 1930, p. 261.

say. Yet in 1582 Gosson dedicated his *Playes Confuted in Five Actions* to Sidney's new father-in-law, Francis Walsingham.

A different attitude from Spenser's is called for. Gosson was looking for Sidney's patronage, and there is evidence that he received it. Considering the earnestness and seriousness of his attack on the theater, patronage for Gosson could not have meant what it did for Spenser. He laid his cause before Sidney because he thought him the best qualified to judge it, and before Walsingham because he thought him the best qualified to prosecute it. Certainly, Spenser's hasty assumption that Gosson was "scorned" by Sidney needs more substantial proof.

WILLIAM R. ORWEN

Rochester, New York

A PROTOTYPE OF THE STORY IN *ZADIG* (CH. III):
LE CHIEN ET LE CHEVAL

Professor Ascoli in his edition of *Zadig*¹ traces the ancestry of the celebrated piece of scientific reasoning embodied in the tale of chapter III, *Le Chien et le Cheval*. Professor Ascoli shows that Voltaire's version is an adaptation or parallel of a story variously related by writers of the XVIIIth century. All these variants are traceable ultimately to one pattern. This primary source is Barthélemy d'Herbelot's *Bibliothèque Orientale*, published in 1697, which first introduced to European readers the tale related by the Persian poet, Amir Khusraw of Delhi (1253-1325).

There is, however, an abridged form of Amir Khusraw's story that goes back a thousand years. It is found in the Talmud, Sanhedrin 104, and is there ascribed to Rabbi Jochanan who lived in the third century. The Rabbi thus relates an instance of the sagacity of the Jews:

It happened once that two men were taken prisoners on Mount Carmel, and their captor walked behind them. One of them said to his companion: "The camel that is going on ahead of us is blind of one eye and is laden with two leathern bags, one with wine and the other with oil, and two men are leading it, one of them a Jew and the other a Gentile." Said their captor to them: "O stiff-necked race, whence do you know this?"

¹ *Zadig*, édité par Georges Ascoli. Soc. des Textes français modernes, pp. 31-32 du Commentaire, Paris, 1929.

They answered him: "The camel is eating of the grass before it on the side on which it sees, but is leaving it uneaten on the side on which it is sightless. And it is laden with two leathern bags, the one of wine and the other of oil,—the one with wine is dripping and the drops are soaked up, while the one with oil is dripping and the drops remain on the surface. And as to the two men leading it, the one a Gentile and the other a Jew, the Gentile voided his excrement upon the road, while the Jew turned off from the road"² Then their captor ran and overtook them and found it was as they said, and he returned and kissed them upon the head and took them to his house and made a great banquet for them. etc

How this Talmundic story came to the knowledge of Amir Khusraw can only be conjectured, but is not difficult to explain in view of the unbroken intercourse between Jews and Moslems through the centuries. That it is still earlier than Rabbi Jochanan seems apparent from his reporting it as an authentic historical illustration of Jewish penetration.

H. Loss

Carleton College

HISTORIC DETAIL IN *THE BORDERERS*

In view of the emphasis ordinarily given to the literary and philosophical sources for Wordsworth's *The Borderers*, the modicum of actual historic detail also deserves some attention. If the setting of the play is indeed the vicinity of Brougham Castle,¹ and the time just subsequent to the Battle of Evesham, August 4, 1265,² then "that villain Clifford" is presumably Roger of the name (1211?-1285?). After a somewhat checkered career in which he raised for the Barons a force of Welsh irregulars much like the Borderers, deserted to the King, broke his parole after Lewes, and yet distinguished himself for that cruel age by saving the life of one of his defeated opponents at Evesham,³ this glorious swashbuckler received as part of the spoils of victory the right of wardship and marriage over Isabella de Vipont (Veteri Ponte)

² A reference to Deuteronomy 23, v. 13

¹ J. H. Smith, "The Genesis of *The Borderers*," *PMLA*, XLIX, 3, (Sept., 1934), 922-930.

² *The Borderers*, II, 1021-1026.

³ Possibly this incident suggested the basis for the friendship between Oswald and Marmaduke. *The Borderers*, I, 27.

who became his daughter-in-law, and brought Brougham Castle into the family.⁴

That Wordsworth was interested in the Cliffords is suggested by his writing some years later the *Song at the Feast of Brougham Castle*,⁵ and it is probably not a coincidence that the incident of Baron Herbert's exclusion from his fief in *The Borderers* should parallel the account of the "Good Lord Clifford's" deposition as given in the *Song*. Each nobleman loses his estate in a civil war, each lives many years in obscurity among humble folk, and each endures countless hardships and humiliations in the most admirable spirit.⁶

Prior to publication of *The Borderers* in 1843, Wordsworth, it will be remembered, changed the names of the characters originally called Mortimer, Rivers, and Matilda to Oswald, Marmaduke, and Idonea, respectively.⁷ If Clifford is Roger de Clifford, then the poet's point of departure in creating the exaggerated figure of Oswald may well have been Clifford's close associate, Roger de Mortimer (1231?-1282) who also changed sides at least once, broke a parole, and founded the greatness of his house.⁸ The renaming of the young captain of the band suggests the influence of Wordsworth's removal from Dorset to the Lake District, since Marmaduke is the designation of various members of the Thweng family who after 1322 held the manor of Grasmere. As to the

⁴ Details from *DNB* Wordsworth seems to have used, among other references, George Ridpath (Redpath), *The Border History of England and Scotland deduced from earliest Times to the Union of the Two Crowns*, London, 1776, and perhaps Nicolson and Burn, *The History and Antiquities of the Counties of Westmoreland and Cumberland*, 2 vols, London, 1792. The poet's wide familiarity with the traditions of the countryside makes specific identification of his historical sources difficult.

⁵ For this suggestion I am indebted to Professor R. D. Havens. Cf. *The White Doe of Rylstone*, I, 264-304.

⁶ Herbert is of course blind. That this detail may be due to the literary convention of "the last of the race" is suggested by the presence of other Ossianic influences as indicated by J. R. Moore, "Wordsworth's Unacknowledged Debt to MacPherson's *Ossian*," *PMLA*, XL, 2, (June, 1925) 362-378.

⁷ E. de Selincourt, "The Hitherto Unpublished Preface to Wordsworth's *Borderers*," *Nineteenth Century and After*, C (Nov 1926), 733 n. That Wordsworth was what might be called name conscious is suggested by the quotations prefixed to Peter Bell.

⁸ Details from *DNB*.

young heroine, the right of wardship and marriage over Idonea de Vipont, sister of Isabella mentioned above, was granted soon after Evesham to another somewhat unscrupulous associate of Clifford's, Roger de Leybourne (d. 1271). Leybourne actually married Idonea to his son, but the tradition that the middle-aged guardian himself became the husband of his young ward to secure her estates has persisted strongly enough to be recorded as fact in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.⁹

No far-reaching conclusions can be drawn from these bits of hypothesis, but in the aggregate they would seem to indicate that, despite the known influence of *Caleb Williams*, *Othello*, and *Die Rauber*, Wordsworth did adapt for his purposes actual historical characters and incidents.

H. F. WATSON

Simpson College

PORPHYRIA'S LOVER

Browning's *Porphyria's Lover* has been called a study in madness, on the strength, perhaps, of his having once entitled it *Madhouse Cell, No. II*. The poem, however, had probably been written as early as 1834, was certainly published in 1836 in *The Monthly Repository*, and so far had been called simply *Porphyria*. Not until 1842, when it was reprinted along with *Johannes Agricola* in *Dramatic Lyrics*, did it receive the invidious title. In 1863 the pair was divided, *Porphyria* becoming *Porphyria's Lover*.

One of Browning's earliest compositions, this poem was a product of the "confessional" mood which had inspired *Pauline* in 1833. Unconventional as Porphyria's lover is, he is no more mad than many another of Browning's heroes. Knowing that Porphyria loves him passionately but has not the strength of character necessary to make her true to him, he thinks it better that she should die rather than sully her spiritual purity in the marriage-bed of a man she does not love. "And yet God has not said a word!" Why should He? Was not this the doctrine Browning was later to preach a thousand and one times?—

⁹ Under Roger de Clifford.

And the sin I impute to each frustrate ghost
 Is—the unlit lamp and the ungirt loin,
 Though the end in sight was a vice, I say.

(*The Statue and the Bust*)

But in 1842 Browning had not the courage of his convictions. His advertisement is well known. "Such poems as the following come properly enough, I suppose, under the head of 'Dramatic Pieces'; being, though for the most part Lyric in expression, always Dramatic in principle, and so many utterances of so many imaginary persons, not mine." So in reprinting *Porphyria* and *Johannes Agricola* he felt they might injure susceptibilities, the former by its unconventional moral, the latter by its scathing satire on religious orthodoxy.¹ The title, *Madhouse Cells*, was a convenient means of fobbing the two poems off as entirely objective studies in mental aberration.

By 1863, however, he had got over the worst pangs of poetical stage-fright, and was undertaking more and more to express his own opinions in his poems. It was time to get rid of the title, *Madhouse Cells*, and the humbug it stood for. Without it no one would have ever thought *Porphyria's Lover* a study in anything madder than the sort of eccentricity readers of Browning are accustomed to.

C. R. TRACY

The University of Alberta

RECENT WORKS ON PROSE FICTION BEFORE 1800¹

Stith Thompson's monumental *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature* is now completed in six volumes, the last being its "Alphabetical Index," of over 600 pages, which should prove one of the most useful tools of research for students of the early history of prose fiction. The sub-title indicates the riches to be found therein,—

¹ See my article in *SP*, xxxiii (1936), 618.

² Because a longer period than usual has passed since my last report, and because a larger number of books and articles than ever before have had to be examined, I am forced to limit my comments to succinct accounts of the chief purposes and uses of the more important books and articles, and sometimes to a mere mention of titles. For the same reasons my personal comments will often seem dogmatic, lack of space preventing presentation of supporting evidence.

"A Classification of Narrative Elements in Folk-Tales, Ballads, Myths, Fables, Medieval Romances, Exempla, Fabliaux, Jest-books, and Local Legends." There seems to be no thing, no creature, no person, no belief, no custom, and almost no subject in human experience, as to which this Index will not furnish you with references to the places where they appear in folk-literature of all the peoples of the world, alphabetically beginning with Aaron's rod and ending with Zuni-girls' facials. It will facilitate research into any topics that received fictional treatment in early times. Hilda M. Ransome's ingenious *Sacred Bee in Ancient Times and Folklore*, rich though it is in apiarian tales, could draw upon it to advantage, and even so theoretic a discussion as Hans M. Wolff's "Die Omnipotenz als literarisches Motiv" (*Neophilologus*, xxii, 270) might be improved by consultation of such items as "God," "Power," etc. Henceforth the discovery (especially, I surmise, in medieval prose chronicles) of unregistered tales, and the pinning of "Not in Stith Thompson" tags to them, will prove a difficult but delightful pursuit among scholars.

The question which Lord Raglan raises in *The Hero* is this: How did the tales of traditional heroes, founders and leaders of nations or cults, originate? He is well qualified for his inquiry; he has a rich classical culture, wide reading in the myths of many peoples, and some anthropological knowledge (of the school of Sir James G. Frazer). To understand, however, why his answer seems to himself so convincing, one ought to be aware of some of his *bêtes-noires*. He dislikes mysticism. "The idea," he says, "that it is natural to believe in the supernatural has only to be stated to show its absurdity" (which may not be as obviously true to everybody else as it is to him). He despises the theory that some myths may have originated in dreams, or, as he puts it, "the idea that a lobster-supper may lead to a new religion." He distrusts local legends which are alleged to have been handed down orally for generations. Though of the ancient house of Somerset, and a descendant of John of Gaunt, he is outspokenly sceptical as to the reliability of most of the pedigrees of the British aristocracy. He doubts the reality of that persistent "race-memory" and "folk-memory" which those scholars postulate who consider many traditional myths to be based on historic events. Uncivilized peoples, without chronology and written records, can have no history; and to suppose the folk can remember incidents of more than 150 years ago (van Gannep granted 200) is to be ignorant and fanciful. Those Norse sagas which are termed "historical" (he maintains against L. H. Gray, H. J. Rose, and others) are misnamed; nor was there any "historic" Arthur or Cuchulann.

The positive thesis of this iconoclastic rationalist is that traditional myth is rooted in ritual worship: it is "a description of what should be done by a king (priest, chief, or magician) in order to secure and maintain the prosperity of his people, told in the form of a narrative of what a hero, that is, an ideal king, etc., once did." In sacred ritual, there is not history, but eternity; life there is constantly being begun again. When we compare the traditional accounts of Zeus, Oedipus, Jason, Romulus, Moses, Elijah, Sigurd, Cuchulainn, King Arthur, Robin Hood, etc., we perceive beneath the superficial differences a common pattern of the hero's life. The chief incidents are twenty-two in number; and a detailed analysis of the lives of twenty-one non-historical heroes shows that in every case many of those incidents are found,—in most cases seventeen or more. In the narratives of historical heroes, e. g. Alexander, only six or seven, at most, of these incidents are present (the author admits that mythical incidents are often attached to historic heroes). The incidents, moreover, are the sort that would be suitable in propitiatory ritual. Among the oft-recurring features of heroic myths which suggest kinship with ritual drama are the many dialogues, soliloquy, prophecy, the seemingly ageless nature of the characters, descriptions of attire, the setting of scenes in porticoes, the use of processions, the single combats (instead of battles), etc.

There is much here that is original, but the basic idea is evidently drawn from Frazer. The pupil, however, tends to carry the theory a great deal farther than the master. Frazer (see *The Golden Bough*, ix, 374) recognized ritual as the source of *some* myths, but Raglan at times seems to hold that it was the source of nearly all important ones. He also assumes that incidents which are notably dramatic can indicate only a ritual origin, ignoring the fact that history, too, may occasionally be dramatic. It is, however, only fair to add that in his closing passages he is somewhat less overconfident than elsewhere, and admits not having sufficient evidence to prove that traditional narrative is *always* connected with the ritual drama. "Yet I hope," he continues, "that this connection is everywhere at least probable, whereas there is nowhere any valid evidence to connect the traditional narrative with historic fact." It will be interesting to learn what Professor and Mrs. Chadwick have to say concerning Raglan's contempt for their faith in tribal historians (he offers the double-barreled retort: savages have no absorbing interest in history; and even if a few had, "patriots are unreliable historians"); and it is to be hoped that they will not ignore this challenging work in the forthcoming last volume of their *Growth of Literature*.

Elizabeth H. Haight's *Essays on Ancient Fiction* contains a good study of Apuleius, but is especially valuable because it includes studies of Greek and Latin fictions that are ordinarily slighted,—Milesian tales, Plutarch's *Bravery of Women*, Parthenius' *Love Romances*, and Seneca's *Controversiæ*. The selected bibliography is excellent.—B. E. Perry, in *Studies in the Text History of the Life and Fables of Aesop* gives the first thorough account of the subject.—The history of the legend of Apollonius of Tyre is set forth in the introduction to Grismer and Atkins' translation of a thirteenth-century Spanish version. The original romance, through a Latin version, Margaret Schlauch (*Classical Weekly*, April 12, 1937) believes, may have influenced the Tristan story.—Many of the fictitious elements of the Alexander romance are traced to their originals in E. Mederer's *Die Alexanderlegenden bei den ältesten Alexanderhistorikern* (*Wurzbürger Studien*).

R. H. Malden interprets the Hebrew religious fictions,—*Tobit*, *Judith*, *Susanna*, etc., in *The Apocrypha*.—A superb edition of a Greek text of *Acta Pauli*, one of the most important early Christian romances, is given us by Carl Schmidt (Hamburg Library), with a thorough account of the relation of the fictitious episodes to their sources.—In *The Desert Fathers*, Helen Waddell has gracefully translated the least fantastical and most appealing passages of *Vitæ Patrum*.—A strange fourth-century fiction is described in N. H. Baynes' "The Death of Julian the Apostate [murdered by two "saints"!] in a Christian Legend" (*Journal of Roman Studies*, xxvii, 22).—Rudolph Willard (*Speculum*, xii, 147) edits the Latin texts of *The Three Utterances of the Soul*, apocrypha of probably Celtic origin.

MEDIEVAL.—The study of Celtic fictions is greatly facilitated by the publication of Cross and Slover's *Ancient Irish Tales*, a collection more ample and varied than any previous one, including not only the better known myths and tales from the eighth to the thirteenth centuries but also place-name stories and the comic masterpiece, *The Vision of MacConglinne* (one hopes that Rabelais was privileged to enjoy it in some language). The only just complaint against this book is that its introductions and notes ought to have been more copious, because Celtic history and literary methods seem to most students foreign and obscure.—Some of the reasons why Celtic fictions were usually related in prose may be discerned in Kenneth Jackson's *Studies in Early Celtic Nature Poetry*.—Sarah Michie (*Speculum*, xii, 304) believes that the so-called "lover's malady" in Irish romance was originally a longing for fairy-women, but was later transferred to human women.

Concerning the Sagas, Einarsson in a review (*MLN.*, lii, 68) makes the significant remarks that there has arisen a "recent school of investigators who look upon the Icelandic sagas as works of art primarily," and that "the art of the Saga is more due to the thirteenth-century writers than to story-tellers of the preceding ages." Those opinions should please Lord Raglan, but it will probably be several years before they are generally acknowledged to be true. Meanwhile we have, as additional evidence for or against that theory, *Four Icelandic Sagas*, well translated by Gwyn Jones; Margaret Schlauch's study of one of the acknowledged *lygisogur* (*MP.*, xxxv, 1), an admirable essay on the treatment of landscape in the sagas (*TLS*, Aug. 29, 1936), and oddments in Dorothy M. Hoare's *Works of Morris and of Yeats in Relation to Early Saga Literature*.

A destructive criticism of Kruger's *Quellen der Schwanritterdichtungen* is made by Willy Krogmann (*Archiv*, clxxi, 1).—Germaine Dempster points out the sources of the *Merchant's Tale* (*MP.*, xxxiv, 133)—Many medieval travel-fictions are to be found in Sir Percy Dykes' *Quest for Cathay*.—In opposition to Bédier, C. Meredith-Jones, in the introduction to his edition of the *Pseudo-Turpin*, maintains that this legend was written not to forward the cult of St. James, but as propaganda for the crusades in the first quarter of the twelfth century; but H. M. Smyser (*JEGP.*, xxxv, 433) raises doubts to this theory (See also Smyser in *Speculum*, xi, 277)—J. S. P. Tatlock discusses the origin of Estrildis in Geoffrey of Monmouth (*Speculum*, xi, 121).—N. E. Griffin edits a critical text of Guido's *Historia Destructionis Troiae*.—K. W. Cameron discovers very many John de Maundevilles; most of them in records of accusation of crime (*Speculum*, xi, 351), while one or two seem to be strong candidates for the authorship of the famous Travels.

SIXTEENTH CENTURY.—Among the new works which, although not especially written for students of fiction, are full of new matter illuminating that subject, are Hardin Craig's *The Enchanted Glass: The Elizabethan Mind in Literature*, and M. Channing Linthicum's *Costume in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*.—Friederich Brie (*E. Studien*, lxxi, 27) emphasizes the merry and satiric qualities in the writing of More; and Algernon Cecil, in *A Portrait of Thomas More*, from a Roman Catholic standpoint, stresses More's significance as an illustration that English culture is preponderantly a Latin culture rather than a Teutonic. This argument dovetails neatly into that of those critics who maintain that the *Utopia* represents the best state of society

which rational man, unaided by revelation, can imagine.—*Directions for Speech and Style*, by John Hoskins, who used Sidney's *Arcadia* as a model of fine literary art, has been well edited by Hoyt H. Hudson (Princeton U. Press)—A good edition of the English *Faust Book* of 1592 is included in Palmer and More's *Sources of the Faust Tradition*, which also contains versions of its forerunners: the legends of Simon Magus, Cyprian of Antioch, and Theophilus of Adana. The *Faustus* is especially welcome because Logeman's text is out of print, and the only available text is a modernized one—Edwin J. O'Brien's *Elizabethan Tales* contains twenty-five representative stories, including translated as well as original ones, and illustrates the rich variety of fictional styles in that period better than any previous collection.—H. E. Rollins, in "Deloney's Sources for Euphuistic Learning" (*PMLA*, li, 399) proves borrowings from Batman and Fortescue, and G. W. Kuehn (*MLN.*, lii, 103) supplies new biographical and bibliographical data about that author (cf. *TLS.*, Apr. 11, Dec. 19, 1936).

The author of *The Heptameron* is vividly depicted in Samuel Putnam's *Marguerite of Navarre*. Though some tough-minded historians may hold that the glories of the French Renaissance are here exaggerated, and its darker aspects minimized, none is likely to describe this work, as Putnam describes that of his predecessor, Miss Freer,—“unpleasantly Protestant in bias, Victorianly spinsterish, and based upon none too reliable sources” Putnam greatly admires Queen Marguerite, and some of her fellow-leaders who, though more or less sincerely faithful to Catholicism, and scorning Calvinism as “the ugliest form of religion and civilization yet known to man,” nevertheless strove to introduce liberal humanism into France. He has tried to understand that period of glaring contrasts, reflected in the *Heptameron*, when with truly human inconsistency men and women seemed to strive with equal ardor towards the gratification of the lusts of the flesh, towards the enlightenment of the mind, and towards the mystic union of the soul with God. Neither in the characterization of the personages, nor in the analyses of the works, has he tried to explain the inexplicable; nor to classify people or books within hard-and-fast categories. What close scrutiny can discover concerning Marguerite's religious and ethical feelings, he sets forth, but without pretending to have fathomed them to their darkest depths. She appears, despite her political and intellectual ambitions, as a devout Catholic, yet a liberal one, whose faith in God and man, at the time when she composed her stories, was tinged with a mild disillusionment, owing to the bitterness of some of her experiences.

Mr. Putnam shows that *The Heptameron* drew largely upon the events in the lives of Marguerite and her acquaintances. Unforgettable in its Renaissance chiaroscuro is his account of the virtuous Marguerite composing the stories aloud (c. 1538-1542) to soothe the restless spirit of her brother, King Francis, a syphilitic libertine, from whom all his mistresses had fled in horror, and whose mind sought in stories of gallantry those gratifications which were now denied to his body. These she provided, borrowing the Boccaccian formula, but applying it to real life, and thus producing "thinly veiled accounts of Francis' own exploits and escapades and those of others well-known at court." She attempted, however, to save her brother's soul, and her own face, by infusing into this hell-broth something of her own Catholic-Platonic spirit. Hence the presence in the tales of herself (as Parlamente) and of her spiritual adviser, the good Bishop Dangu (as Dagoncin). Hence such a notable passage as that in which Parlamente declares:

I call perfect lovers those who seek, in the object of their love, some perfection, whether it be beauty, goodness or pleasing grace, striving ever for virtue, and who are so high and honest of heart that they would not, to save themselves from death fix their minds upon those low things which honor and conscience frown upon; for the soul, which only has been created that it may return to its own sovereign good, so long as it remains within this our body, has but one desire, and that is, to reach its destination

The presence of such passages may be condemned from an aesthetic point of view, as Putnam admits, but he insists, and (I think) proves, that they are sincere. His interpretations of Marguerite and her work do not contradict those of Ste.-Beuve and Lanson; but his is the first account in English which shows what kind of woman is reflected in *The Heptameron* and which makes her seem alive and credible.

SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.—Koeppel believed that the first complete English translation (1620) of the Decameron was based on Salviati's bowdlerized Italian version, and Edward Hutton, that it was based on Le Maçon's French. Herbert G. Wright (*MLR.*, xxxi, 500) finds that the Englishman used both, not suppressing, as Salviati did, the satire against the clergy, but following him in changing passages "open to criticism on moral grounds." The result was an inaccurate and wordy performance, in some passages "entirely foreign to the spirit of Boccaccio."—Helmut Minkowski, in "Die geistesgeschichtliche und literarische Nachfolge der *Neu-Atlantis*" (*Neophilologus*, xxii, 120, and 185) traces the influence of Bacon's work upon the establishment of academies, and upon

general culture, in England, Germany, and France. Grant McColley, in "The Pseudonyms of Francis Godwin" (*PQ.*, xvi, 78) shows that the mysterious "E. M." of the introduction to *The World of the Moon* was Godwin himself; and elsewhere (*MP.*, xxxv, 47) that it was written c. 1627-28, ten years before its publication.—J. A. Bourne, in "Some English Translations of Spanish Novels" (*MLR.*, xxxi, 555), identifies the originals of *Drana*, *Duchess of Mantua* (1679), *D. Henriquez de Castro* (1692), and *Novelas Españolas*, 1747.—A. Gonçalves Rodrigues' *The Letters of a Portuguese Nun: History and Criticism of a Literary Fraud* maintains that the letters are fictitious and were composed by a man.—Edward D. Seeber (*PMLA.*, li, 953) demonstrates that *Oroonoko* was remarkably popular in eighteenth-century France and influenced several French novels in that century and the next.

EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.—Kenneth MacLean's *John Locke and English Literature of the Eighteenth Century* contains some useful contributions with regard to Swift and Sterne, but on the whole seems to have a rather feeble grasp on the metaphysical questions which are involved in such an inquiry (for a detailed analysis of its weaknesses, see *PQ.*, xvi, 180).

Archibald B. Shepperson's *Novel in Motley: a History of the Burlesque Novel in English* has a promising subject, which might have been made both entertaining and instructive, but which is treated in a way that disappoints one's expectations. In recent years we have had numerous illustrations of how the history of a fictional genre should be composed, particularly from German scholars, and surely no properly trained student would suppose, as Shepperson apparently assumes, that one can write a "history" of a genre without giving a clear and exact idea of the differentia of that genre, or without tracing the causal interrelationships between the various works and their backgrounds. All that we have here is a descriptive account, accompanied with rather obvious comments, of burlesque novels, the important ones among them having been described sufficiently already. Shepperson is aware that parody is a branch of criticism; but if one asks just what special contributions to the history of fictional criticism were made by the genre, one will find in his work only vague replies. "It was," he says, "by far the most effective criticism"; but how so, or why so, we are not told. There are amateurish blunders, such as a reference to a well-known French scholar as "Mr. Digeon"; and the style, meant to be pleasant, is at times exasperating,—e. g.: "Pamela is pretty and vivacious, and withal demure, religious, and honest,

lation of the 1710's may seem strange; but he says that to him the *Nights* were as inartistic as "the odd paintings on Indian screens." Defoe refused to join in the growing admiration for the Chinese people and Chinese art, and Richardson ridiculed what seemed to him the unjustifiable mania for collecting Chinese porcelain. Allen knew that most of the writers of so-called oriental tales and imitations were ignorant of genuinely oriental spirit and atmosphere; but he showed that many pre-romantics were at least groping towards an understanding of it,—among them Percy, Walpole, Beckford, and Charles Wilkins (translator of the *Hitopadesa*, 1787). The natural affinity between anti-classical literature and anti-classical art is perhaps best exemplified in the charming illustration of a lady's fan, upon which there are pictured scenes from *A Sentimental Journey*, drawn with an emotional freedom in harmony with the abandon of the story.

It is true (as, with characteristic condescension, was stated in the leading article of *TLS.*, July 17, 1937) that Allen in his desire to stress the importance of studying the arts comparatively, sometimes reiterated the obvious, and therefore may seem to sophisticated Europeans "naïve" in some of his comments. But the fact remains that none of the British has done what he accomplished. Granting that his collection of historical data is better than his critical interpretation of them, his life-work remains an admirable achievement. Its most serious imperfections are owing to the fact that important works in his field were not published before his fatal illness. He was apparently unable to use a study which bore very closely upon his subject, W. H. Smith's *Architecture in English Fiction*,² wherein there are cited a dozen fictions not mentioned by him.

John Steegman's *Rule of Taste: From George I to George IV* makes no pretense to be more than a pleasing account for the general reader. At the other extreme is Bernard Fehr's speculative and abstruse discussion, "The Antagonism of Forms in the Eighteenth Century" (*E. Studies*, xviii, 115 and 193) where the interrelationship of the arts is philosophized about in a manner which some will find profound, but which R. S. Crane (*PQ*, xvi, 160) scorns as merely "metaphorical and neo-platonic."

Herman Teerink's *Bibliography of the Writings in Prose and Verse of Jonathan Swift* is regarded by Harold Williams (*RES.*, July, 1937) as better than any work of the kind hitherto available, but as ill-arranged and to be used with caution. He supplies corrections, and others are to be found in *TLS.*, Mch. 20, 1937.—

² Cf. my review, *MLN*, li, 254.

Inquisition into the mystery of Swift's marriage to Stella continues unabated, in Maxwell B. Gold's treatise on that subject, in Bertram Newman's *Jonathan Swift*, and elsewhere, but no conclusive verdict is reached. There is a marked inclination to believe that the marriage took place but was not consummated; yet T. Percy C. Kirkpatrick (*TLS.*, June 19, 1937) presents forceful reasons why Swift and the Bishop of Clogher would not have engaged in so flagrant a violation of the ecclesiastical canons.—In the interpretation of Swift's works there has been substantial progress. Canon C. Looten's *La Pensée Religieuse de Swift* is, to be sure, reactionary in tendency, and illustrates how difficult it is for a Catholic to understand one who, as Quintana says, was not a High Churchman but "a Tory devoted to the Church," and therefore apt to displease both those who wanted the Church to dominate the State, and those who wanted the State to dominate the Church. Both M. A. Korn's *Weltanschauung Jonathan Swifts* (which includes a useful history of the controversies about Swift), and Ricardo Quintana's admirable *Mind and Art of Jonathan Swift* move away from the old-fashioned concept of him as utterly misanthropic and irreligious, and recognize that he regarded man as *animal rationis capax*,—*capax*, however, not by ritual ceremonies alone, but also by increase of knowledge and steadier use of intelligence. Lilli Handro's *Gullwer's Travels im Zusammenhang mit geistesgeschichtlichen Beziehungen* is written in a repulsively involved style, but independently arrives at the same conclusion: "Swift's Satire geht von keinem blasphemischen Gedanken aus, ihre Spitze ist nicht gegen die Religion, sondern gegen ihre Vertreter und Anhänger gerichtet." She contributes a valuable analysis of the relation of Swift's thought to Berkeley and other English philosophers.

A charmingly written biography is James Sutherland's *Defoe*, but it is inclined to be too lenient in its judgment of his character. A corrective is found in T. F. M. Newton's "Civet-Cats of Newington Green" (*RES.*, xii, 10), a thoroughly documented exposure of one of his many crooked dealings. The Germans, who apparently expect Englishmen to be entirely logical and consistent, although no such race of human beings is found elsewhere, are perturbed by the contrast between Defoe's high-minded thoughts and mean deeds; also by contradictions in his utterances. Ulrich tried to overcome the difficulty by declaring the accusations against Defoe to be false; others declared that his pious utterances were insincere. Rudolf Stamm's *Der aufgeklärte Puritanismus Daniel Defoes* rejects those facile explanations, and seeks to prove that

Defoe, educated as a Puritan, became a devotee of the Enlightenment, with the result that sometimes he spoke and acted as the former, and at other times as the latter. If there is a visitation of the plague, have faith in God, and do nothing, but, on second thoughts, find the scientific way out, help yourself, and God will help you! Whatever one may think of Stamm's theory, he renders a useful service by his exposition of Defoe's opinions on such topics as politics, religion, ethics, economics, art, etc. (Cf. his essay in *PQ.*, xv, 225).

The most learned of the recent monographs on the eighteenth-century novelists is A. D. McKillop's *Samuel Richardson: Printer and Novelist*. It is based upon a closer scrutiny of the manuscript collections than had previously been made, and fortified by exceptionally wide knowledge of the literature of the period. The quotations from periodicals and cyclopedias are illuminating (e. g., the estimate of Richardson in the *New and General Biographical Dictionary* in 1762). The chapter "Reputation and Influence" covers everything of importance in English and continental criticism, and furnishes the best brief survey of fiction from 1750-1800 that can be found. The literary importance of the third and fourth books of *Pamela* is revealed for the first time. Throughout, the judgment is as sound as the information; typical of its sanity is the passage: "Diffidence, naive vanity, and artistic subtlety were strangely mingled in Richardson's career with the unshakable steadfastness and sobriety of the tradesman." William M. Sale has compiled *Samuel Richardson. a Bibliographical Record* (cf. his data about *Clarissa* in *The Library*, xvi, 448); and F. G. Black describes three continuations of *Pamela* (*RAA.*, xii, 499). Paul Dottin weighs the advantages and limitations of the epistolary method (*RAA.*, xii, 481).

George Sherburn gives a discerning appreciation of Fielding's *Amelia* (*ELH.*, iii, 1), and Mrs. Esdaile an account of S. C. Stanley, Fielding's Danish translator (*TLS.*, Apr. 3, 1937).

Eugène Joliat's *Smollett et la France* is more than a history of that author's rather unfavorable reception there. It is an important contribution to the study of picaresque fiction, tracing Smollett's indebtedness to seventeenth- and eighteenth-century satirical and roguish fictions, and displaying fine critical perspicience in comparing Smollett's works with those of Sorel, Scarron, Furetière, and especially Le Sage. The author, a French Canadian, trained at McGill, is equally appreciative of the subtler qualities of English and of French literary atmosphere and style. One hopes for more studies of this type from him and his fellow-Canadians.

Henri Fluchère's "Sterne Epistolier" (*RAA.*, xiii, 297) is not merely a review of Curtis' edition of the Letters, but an original essay on Sterne's character as therein manifested.—Theodore Baird (*PMLA.*, li, 803) proves that Rapin and Tindall were Sterne's authorities for the historical background of *Tristram Shandy*, and he examines in detail the time-scheme, finding it astonishingly consistent and free from all but a few minor slips.—Gertrude J. Hallamore's *Das Bild Laurence Sternes in Deutschland* shows that the rationalistic critics preferred *Tristram Shandy* to *The Sentimental Journey* because they thought there was in it more of the higher comic spirit; that the classicists, e. g. Goethe, recognized his uniqueness but would not imitate him, and that he had to await the romantic period (not here studied) before being deeply understood and appreciated.

Rudolf Maack's *Laurence Sterne im Lichte seiner Zeit* is a learned work, citing copiously chapter and verse in support of its arguments, but it is likewise philosophical, and perhaps some will condemn it as speculative if not as "neo-Platonic." It is courageous, attempting to recapture some intangible qualities of Sterne's time the presence of which may now and then be felt but the fixation of which is exceedingly difficult. To Maack, Sterne is not the exceptional figure that he seems to be when compared only with Richardson, Fielding, Johnson, or even with Mackensie and Burns. In his view, the most significant feature of that period was not that attitudes towards life were changing, but that in several fields of art men were, more or less blindly, groping for *methods of expressing* the new attitudes. To establish this point he turns aside from the beaten tracks of literary history and shows that a revolt against clear, direct, and obvious methods of communicating feelings was going on in the fields of acting (very interesting similarities between Garrick's styles and Sterne's), opera, dancing, etc. Sterne's views not of literature only, but also of painting, music, the ballet, and other arts are analyzed; and parallels between the new trends in those domains and his own methods are suggested.

Christopher Lloyd's *Fanny Burney* is a good biography, but does not pretend to make substantial contributions towards the criticism or history of her literary works. Why Mme. D'Arblay was an "intermédiaire manquée" between England and France, despite her marriage to a Frenchman and long residence in his country, is set forth by Eugénie Delachaux (*RLC.*, xv, 381).

H. H. Clark's American Fiction Series presents two eighteenth-century American novels, Brackenridge's *Modern Chivalry* (ed.

C. M. Newlin) and Brown's *Ormond* (ed. E. Marchand), textually reliable, and very well edited. G. H. Orians sketching the history of the criticism of fiction from 1789-1810 (*PMLA.*, lii, 195) shows what a poor press the American authors of such "chimerical works" had in those days.

Bernard Fehr, at Zurich, and Otto Funke, at Berne, have stimulated a lively interest in the history of fictional techniques, the latest fruit of which is Willi Buhler's *Die Erlebte Rede im Englischen Roman*. By the term "erlebte Rede" is meant soliloquy, or the self-communing, of a character without any intrusion of the author. It is a useful device for the realistic novel. Buhler seeks for traces of it in the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century novel, and finds a few, probably accidental, anticipations of it in Mrs. Behn, Defoe, and Richardson; but it appears not to have been deliberately employed with artistic skill by any one before Jane Austen, to whom the main portion of this monograph is devoted. Studies like this, of the history of technical devices, are much needed in the earlier periods.

ERNEST BERNBAUM

University of Illinois

REVIEWS

Gentlefolk in the Making. Studies in the History of English Courtesy Literature and Related Topics from 1531 to 1774.

By JOHN E. MASON Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1935. Pp. xiv + 393. \$4.00.

The Complete Letter-Writer in English, 1568-1800. By KATHERINE GEE HORNBEAK. Northampton: Smith College, 1934. Pp. xii + 150. Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, xv, Nos. 3-4.

For years students of English literature have recognized the want of a comprehensive work dealing with the literature of courtesy. A few scattered contributions have been made in English: the Introduction to Bulbring's edition of Defoe's *Compleat English Gentleman* (1890), the Introduction to Raleigh's edition of Hobbes's translation of *Il Cortegiano* (1900), various—though not many—articles in the scholarly journals; and Miss Ruth Kelso's admirable treatment of Renaissance courtesy in *The Doctrine of the English Gentleman in the Sixteenth Century* (1929). But no one had

reviewed systematically the literature of the subject in England. The want has been increasingly felt as students have come to acknowledge the importance of such writings as background for the life and thought of past centuries.

It is this want that Mr. Mason has set out to supply. The title, "Gentlefolk in the Making," smacking strongly of social history, is arresting but less accurately descriptive than the subtitle, "Studies in the History of English Courtesy Literature." The author, after a thoughtful preliminary chapter on Types and Tendencies in Courtesy Literature before 1531, in which he shows admirable familiarity with the classical and medieval background, takes us, chronologically, book by book, from Elyot's *Boke of the Governour* through James's *Basileikon Doron*, and thence, combining chronology with type, through the many works of parental advice, polite conduct, education, "policy" (the courtier's art), and civility, of the seventeenth and most of the eighteenth century. The result is an admirable handbook or work of reference (unfortunately minus a bibliography, which is promised in a later volume), where one may find digests of all of the well-known writings on courtesy and polite conduct of the period, as well as of a great many slightly-known and relatively unknown works besides, together with some discussion of relations between them.

The surprising thing, to most students, will be the mass of material available. Few persons have had any inkling what a stupendous number of works on courtesy and conduct were produced in the three centuries under consideration. And although some additional seventeenth- and eighteenth-century titles could be supplied, Mr. Mason has caught a vast preponderance of the works which should have been fish to his net. He has confined himself almost entirely to works aimed primarily at inculcating doctrines of aristocratic ideals and polite behavior. He has not gone, to any great extent, to the dramatists and poets and essayists for sidelights. By the same token, he has not attempted to assess *practice* as against *ideals*. Indeed, his aim is to spread before the student the many writings on the subject, apportioning space with an eye to the importance of a given work, but in each case supplying a pretty full analysis of the contents of each, with some comment upon it.

It is here, indeed, that Mr. Mason's book exhibits its limitation (aside from occasional lapses; four lines devoted to Spenser, for instance, seem strangely inadequate). The preliminary chapter on Types and Tendencies gives promise of more synthetic thought than the rest of the book reveals. From that chapter on, it is little more than a collection of critical analyses of individual works—useful for reference mainly, and from the fact that many of these books are rare and hard to come by. We are therefore indebted to Mr. Mason for reading them with care and reporting

their contents. He has made us conscious of a vast field of writing of which most scholars were scarcely aware. But one regrets that the book, admirable in its careful scholarship, lacks constructive thought about changing ideals of conduct or a synthetic picture of what various ages conceived as their ideal.

Miss Hornbeak's problem was twofold: to show the background of Richardson's *Familiar Letters*, and to present as full a bibliography as possible of sixteenth- to eighteenth-century manuals of letter-writing. Starting with William Fulwood's *The Enemie of Idlenesse* (1568), she proposes to show that

the earliest English letter-writers are purely derivative, translations or imitations of the Latin formularies, with some indebtedness to Italian and French sources. With Nicholas Breton's letter-writer, *A Poste with a Packet of Madde Letters*, a Spanish strain, seemingly rising from Guevara, appears. By the middle of the seventeenth century, French preciosity of the 'conceit-confetti' sort is rampant through English translations of French handbooks. In the last quarter of the seventeenth century English common sense asserts itself, and there emerges at last a native, indigenous, homespun letter-writer, in which the English novel is firmly rooted.

This development Miss Hornbeak traces in detail. The investigation of Richardson's background is valuable. Unfortunately, considerations of space prevented a similarly full account of Richardson's work itself. But enough is said to show where Richardson may have got many of the ideas, as well as the bourgeois tone, characteristic of the *Familiar Letters*.

The bibliography of letter-writers from 1568 to 1800 is exceptionally full, though it would be more usable if the Index enabled one to trace *all* works (not merely those mentioned in the text) through their various editions.¹ Some titles, it is true, are only "ghosts" from the Term Catalogues and other lists, but Miss Hornbeak has actually seen a surprising number of letter-writers from all periods. A few exceptions may be noted. Had Miss Hornbeak known a certain work of 1635, she would almost certainly have altered the date in Chapter II, "Préciosité and the English Letter-Writer, 1640-1840;" for the statement that "Balzac begat de la Serre. La Serre begat *Le Secrétaire de la cour* and *Le Secrétaire à la mode*, which in turn begat *The Secretary in Fashion* [1640], *The Academy of Complements* [1640], and other translations and imitations almost without number," may be emended to include *The Mirrovr of Complements* (1635). This, rather than *The Academy of Complements*, seems to be, in Miss Hornbeak's words, "the first fruits of La Serre in England." Besides set

¹ *Wits Labyrinth*, by J. S. (1648)—a phrase-book (not a letter-writer, but related to it) containing "complementall expressions" for writers and speakers; *The Academy of Pleasure* (1665)—model letters, dialogues, etc.; *The Art of Courtship . . . Elegant Epistles* (1672); and *Wit a-la mode . . . how to superscribe and begin letters to persons of all ranks* (1775) might well have been included.

speeches "To offer service to a King," and the like, and dialogues such as "To salute a Gentlewoman with an intention of marriage, and to offer her his service," the volume contains "Complementall letters of sundry natures to persons of severall qualities, with their answers," as well as such model epistles as "A letter of acknowledgement," "To a sicke friend," etc. It is, in a word, both phrase-book, and letter-writer.² One important seventeenth-century letter-writer—Henry Care's *The Female Secretary* (1671), which Miss Hornbeak apparently knows only from the Term Catalogues, but which is in the Huntington Library—illustrates various things to which she could not assign an earlier date than 1687, when *The Young Secretary's Gunde* appeared. Care's letters—more natural and genuine-sounding than most model letters in seventeenth-century letter-writers—are admittedly for bourgeois folk: "'Tis enough if he [the author] can order affairs so, as the waiting Gentlewoman may henceforwards be converted from her Idolatrous poring on the Academy, and the *Chambermaid* not suffer a *Non-plus*, when the Chaplain assaults her with his Rhetoricating Epistle."

W. LEE USTICK

Cambridge, Massachusetts

Literary Relations of England and Scandinavia in the Seventeenth Century. By ETHEL SEATON. Oxford: The Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1935. Pp. xvi + 384. \$5.00.

This volume is the fourth of *The Oxford Studies in Modern Languages and Literature* published under the editorship of Professor H. G. Fiedler, Taylor Professor of German at Oxford. The author, Fellow and Tutor of English Literature at St. Hugh's College, has already made an important contribution to the history of English-Scandinavian relationships in her *Queen Elizabeth and a Swedish Princess*, a skillfully edited printing of James Bell's contemporary account of the visit of Princess Cecilia, daughter of Gustavus Vasa, to the English Court. The present volume is a continuation and extension of the research auspiciously there begun. It proves to be a thorough, amply documented study of every possible aspect of the intellectual commerce between England and Scandinavia during the seventeenth century.

² The Huntington Library has what appears to be an earlier edition (perhaps 1634, when *The Mirrour of Complements* was first entered), without title-page, but with caption and running title "The Mirrour of Complements,"—a work which contains all the set speeches before the "Complementall letters," but none of the 35 or 40 pages of letters of the edition of 1635, which would seem to be a redaction of the Huntington *Mirrour*.

The essence of the book is a description of the processes by which the ignorance and picturesque misinformation about Scandinavia prevalent in England at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign became superseded by an eighteenth century acquaintance with the life and literature of the North which enabled "at least one group of Englishmen . . . to travel through the region of Old Norse myth and saga in the footsteps of their northern contemporaries." The author examines first the news which adventurous explorers of the North and then the various traders, such as the whaler, the falconer, the dealers in copper and timber, etc., brought back to the quays and shops of London. She then shows how the political ties, particularly between England and Denmark, deepened diplomatic channels through which friendliness between the courts was promoted and communication between the learned was facilitated. Students from Scandinavia, attracted by the treasures of the Bodleian Library and later by the fame of the Royal Society, kept fresh England's knowledge of contemporary movements of thought, particularly in Denmark and Sweden, and carried home information about English life and letters. Finally the antiquarians on both sides of the water enriched the intellectual intercourse by their study of myth and historical fact and their interest in those forms of popular superstition from time immemorial associated with the North. All of these subjects Miss Seaton treats with learning and literary skill. Her work is not only vastly informative, but also uniformly entertaining.

Some doubts exist in the mind of this reviewer whether the book can in any real sense be regarded as a study of literary relations. Sir William Craigie in his lectures on *The Northern Element in English Literature* delivered at the University of Toronto in 1931 said, "To look for northern traits in English literature prior to the eighteenth century might almost be set down as a forlorn quest." This, the widely accepted opinion, has not been appreciably corrected by Miss Seaton's researches. She deals entirely with the intellectual materials of various sorts from which works of literature are composed. For example, she examines store-houses filled with magic, witchcraft, and folk-lore, as well as with natural wonders, which the North offered to English writers. She accumulates the knowledge of science, of social life, and of individual character which flowed between England and Scandinavia. Very seldom does she fail to follow her clues to their logical end or to present everything of importance in her purview. However, at least once she passes by a source of information which might yield important results. In reviewing John Craig's letters to Tycho Brahe, she ignores those passages which are "chiefly on astronomy," yet we have recently learned that the new astronomical ideas liberated in England during the sixteenth century, particularly that of an infinite universe, were of enormous importance to literature. The activities of the recently reconstructed School of Night, for example,

apparently exerted a profound influence upon the thought and imagination of Raleigh, Marlowe, and Chapman. Any new information about the state of astronomical knowledge in England, particularly if it concerns Tycho Brahe, would now be eagerly read by all students of the sixteenth century. John Craig's omitted views on astronomy are thus of much greater significance than his printed reference to the English visit of a learned Dane, named Petrus Paysen. But such errors of critical judgment rarely appear in Miss Seaton's work.

The fact remains, however, that this book concerns literature only in that it deals with such reminiscences of the North as might persist in the mind of a writer who had obtained the proper information through books or by word of mouth. The author makes no effort to discover the intellectual qualities peculiar to Scandinavians or to analyze their distinctive attitude toward such favorite subjects as witchcraft, sea-faring, or war. Consequently she does not consider the influence which these men of the North had upon the literary forms or the spirit of English writers. To be sure, the facts which Miss Seaton presents show that the intellectual contacts between English and the Scandinavians were many and important, while the actual literary influences were few and negligible. Yet one could wish that her keen powers of analysis had been applied to explanation of the curious fact that the ample materials which she has collected had no formative effect even upon the few English authors whose works casually reveal some information about the life, lore, and letters of Scandinavia.

OSCAR JAMES CAMPBELL

Columbia University

Spenser's Theory of Friendship. By CHARLES G. SMITH. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1935. Pp. viii + 74. \$1.25.

Two Centuries of Spenserian Scholarship. By JEWEL WURTSBAUGH. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1936. Pp. xii + 174. \$2.25.

In *Spenser's Theory of Friendship* Professor Smith does a service by collecting four fugitive articles and supplementing them with a note on the influence of Alain de l'Isle on the Fourth Book of *The Faerie Queene*. Though the chapters are not integrated, they justify the author's modest claim that his "study breaks new ground." Beginning with a comparison of Spenser's Concord, the "Mother of Blessed Peace," to her counterparts in several sixteenth-century masques, chapter two goes on to relate her allegory to kindred conceptions of Gascoigne and Holinshed and of several other poets and some "politicians" both English and continental. The

fourth paper interprets the false Florimel as a Platonic myth proving that "Friendship is Based on Virtue" (p. 27), and so relates her to the allegory studied in the third chapter, where that principle ranks first in a discussion of seven traditional maxims which are represented as organic in *The Legend of Friendship*.

No one is likely to challenge Mr. Smith's "endeavor in the first chapter to show that . . . in the Fourth Book Spenser conceived of Friendship as the operation in the world of man of a principle of cosmic love," (p. 1), but I demur when he adds that this principle was "based on Lucretius' Hymn to Venus." To corroborate his cosmic interpretation, he compares the allegory of the Fourth Book to that in *Mutabilitie*, suggesting that the resemblance is close enough to indicate a close sequence of one upon the other. Then, relating the paraphrase of Lucretius' Hymn in Spenser's tenth canto to the "Lucretian" elements in *Mutabilitie*, he observes that "there seems to be nothing distinctively Christian in Book Four" (p. 12). Meanwhile, ignoring the Christian cast of the Neo-Platonism in *Four Hymnes*, he has identified the allegory of Concord with their "conception of love as a harmonizing and unifying force" (p. 5). But there is no less weight in the Christianity of the *Hymnes* than there is in the "Lucretianism" of *Mutabilitie*. Indeed, the more analogies from Renaissance literature are brought to bear, the more Christian the allegory of Book Four appears. "The conception of law in Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* as the bond that binds the whole creation to God," says Professor Smith, "is essentially Spenser's conception of Concord" (p. 22). None of his other parallels is so damaging as this to his contention that there is nothing Christian in Book Four, but his evidence shows that Spenser's thought was an integral part of the Christianized Neo-Platonism which stemmed from Ficino and Pico della Mirandola.

Professor Greenlaw once compared¹ the theory of ultimate reality in *The Faerie Queene* to Giordano Bruno's, though he failed to understand that—as M. Charbonnel and Sig. Gentile have since shown²—both the ethics and the metaphysics of Bruno were thoroughly Plotinian. The moot question of Bruno's influence need not enter here. What should be recognized is the fact that his unconventional treatment of Venus in *Lo Spaccio de la Bestia Trionfante*,³ where Sofia quotes her invocation by Lucretius in the hymn which Spenser translated, is Neo-Platonic rather than Epicurean. Her rôle as patroness of Spenser's virtue of friendship is essenti-

¹ *SP*, xvii, 340

² In *L'Éthique de Bruno et le deuxième dialogue du Spaccio*, Paris, 1919, J. Roger Charbonnel proves Bruno's ethics Plotinian through and through. Giovanni Gentile, in *Giordano Bruno e il Pensiero del Rinascimento*, Florence, 1925, pp. 223-4, argues that Bruno's *minimi* were Neo-Platonic rather than Lucretian.

³ *Opere Italiane*, ed. Gentile, Bari, 1927, II, 34-7. Although Mr. Smith quotes Bruno in another connection, he does not mention *Lo Spaccio*.

ally like her rôle in *Lo Spaccio*.⁴ There she lays claim to the seat in the skies from which the Heavenly Twins have been driven, in order to seat *Amicizia*, *Amore* and *Pace* in their place.

Although its treatment of the *View* is sketchy, Miss Wurtsbaugh's first chapter is an admirable survey of the ground covered by Mr. Francis R. Johnson's record of the editorial tradition of the poetry down to the folio of 1679, and beyond to the appearance of Hughes's edition. Her main interest, however, is in the critical "drift" in which her final paragraph names Jortin, Upton, Warton, and Todd as the chief sea-marks. "The deeper significance of this study," she says, "is the discovery that the commentators were painfully and laboriously struggling towards 'the truth that sets men free.'" Yet her readers may doubt whether the eighteenth-century scholars were enlightened explorers or wayward pioneers in a forest to which they never found the clue. She is a shrewd judge of the merits of the great editors and commentators. Only in Upton's case does she seem to me to err from lack of insight. Though he gets generous credit for having recognized that *The Faerie Queene* was an historical allegory and for making "the first important study of it as such," he is too severely condemned for his "classical bias and argumentative skill" (p. 80). A modern student should deal respectfully with the "classical bias" of an editor whose knowledge was never at fault even among writers as obscure as Valerius Flaccus, who—poor fellow—suffers fission (p. 56) into two authors by an error of Miss Wurtsbaugh's printer. Upton's bias made him no less alert than his contemporaries to all the newly discovered interests in Spenser. Like Hurd and Warton—and before them both, as Miss Wurtsbaugh observes (p. 80)—he was "not wholly indifferent to the likeness between the 'extensive and complicated story of *The Faerie Queene*' and 'some ancient and magnificent pile of Gothic architecture.'"

The Gothic pile might be taken as the emblem of eighteenth-century Spenserian study, with its ramifications into source-hunting among the romances and its curiosity about the backgrounds of chronicle history and of the masques and pageants. The mid-century effort to improve the text is interesting mainly because it rehabilitated the archaic language which seventeenth-century editors had more or less "modernized." Critical discussion centered on the question of unity in *The Faerie Queene* and reached the extreme opposite to Upton's position when Warton averred that the poem "has no plan!" and then rushed on, as if from Gothic formlessness it followed as the night the day, to assert that the poem was "the careless exuberance of a warm imagination and strong sensibility." In that mistake, although Miss Wurtsbaugh makes Todd the "bridge" (p. 157) between the Augustans and the Romantics, it is perhaps justifiable to see a door opening upon the impressionistic

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 180.

excesses of the nineteenth century and the recalcitrance of some twentieth-century criticism to recognition of any serious design in *The Faerie Queene*.

MERRITT Y. HUGHES

The University of Wisconsin

Speculum Sacerdotale, edited from British Museum Ms. Additional 36791. By EDWARD H. WEATHERLY. London, 1936. Early English Text Society, No. 200.

Unless I am mistaken, Dr. Weatherly's edition of the anonymous *Speculum Sacerdotale* is the first edition of a Middle English manuscript to be published as a direct result of the stimulation to the study of medieval English sermons afforded by Owst's two volumes concerning them. The *Speculum*, a prose work, is very similar to the *Festial*, the well-known aid to preachers provided by John Mirk. It contains materials for an extensive series of sermons *de sanctis* and *de tempore*. The author's purpose is generally to explain ecclesiastical usage by exposition and illustrative narrative rather than to exhort sinners. At one point he turns aside from his purpose of giving instructions for sermons and inserts a penitential, just as Mirk in ch 29 (ed. Erbe) of the *Festial* stops sermonizing long enough to tell untutored priests how they should answer certain questions which their parishioners might put. Like the *Festial*, the *Speculum*, as I have intimated, emphasizes the narrative element in sermons; and again like the *Festial*, it was apparently composed in the West Midlands early in the fifteenth century. (One wonders whether both of these works must have been compiled before the Arundel Constitutions imposed severe restrictions on English preaching in 1409.) And yet in spite of the many resemblances between the *Speculum* and the *Festial*, there seems to be no evidence that either author knew of the work of the other (see Dr. Weatherly's introduction, p. xlv).

It is difficult to say how nearly these printed items approximate what preachers using the *Speculum* actually said. Every form of medieval sermon with which I am acquainted made use of a Biblical passage as a point of departure. This fact is as true of sermons based on saints' festivals as of any other. The unpublished treatise on sermon form ascribed by Th. Charland to John of Wales ("A Brief *Forma Predicandi*," *MP.*, xxxiv, 338), for instance, says (Ms. Maz. 569, f. 85v), "Post hec de sermonibus festiualibus sunt & aliqua documenta. Primum est ut queratur thema in nouo [uel] in veteri testamento quod sit proprium sollempnitati." But the *Speculum*, again like the *Festial*, never suggests a theme for the preachers to use. Further, the treatises on sermon form edited

by H. Caplan (*Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James Albert Winans*, N. Y., 1925, pp. 61 ff.) and by A. de Poorter (*Revue néo-scholastique de philosophie*, xxv, 192 ff.), and that wrongly included among the works of Bonaventura in the Quaracchi edition (ix, 16 ff.), describe in considerable detail the methods which preachers may use in expanding the fundamental information to be presented in their sermons. The *Speculum* makes no considerable use of these methods. In his *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England*, Owst emphasizes the absorption of the preachers with the events and scenes of the life about them (see particularly chs. 5-7). But the *Speculum* gives no evidence of such absorption. Is not the *Speculum*, then, composed of materials which a preacher was expected to appropriate and expand more or less, according to his ability or his industry or the importance of the occasion upon which he was to preach, rather than of actual sermons? (See also Dr. Weatherly's introduction, p. xxxix.)

I have referred above to manuals on sermon form. The *Speculum* is not one of these. They explain how the preacher should handle his material, the *Speculum* presents the material and says nothing about the form. As a reservoir of facts to be used by preachers it is a valuable document.

Dr. Weatherly has performed his editorial task excellently. The explanatory notes are precise and illuminating; their diversity indicates the thoroughness with which the editor has explored the background of his material. I have read at random a number of pages of the text against a photostat of the manuscript and have found the text accurate and intelligently transcribed. The most striking feature of the introduction is the completeness with which the sources drawn upon by the unknown author are identified. In his description of the sources, however, and in the other portions of the introduction, the editor has wisely refrained from burdening the reader with masses of details and has presented his facts in a lucid and readable fashion.

WOODBURN O. ROSS

Wayne University

The Clubs of Augustan London. By ROBERT J. ALLEN. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933. Pp. xii + 306. \$3.00. (Harvard Studies in English, vii.)

This is a scholarly and trustworthy guide to a subject which has long been in need of systematic treatment. All students of the period know something of the clubs and wish to know more; Dr. Allen enables them to piece out the account by giving them practically all the available evidence. The resulting view of the subject is of course not entirely complete and coherent; a club is an

elusive entity, hard to describe and harder to follow through politics, society, and literature. "Many societies," remarks the author, "defy all attempts to trace their history." Too rigid an organization and too definite a purpose destroyed "clubability", even when clubs served the ends of hot political faction, principle was subordinated to personality. The true club was an informal group which kept no records and was likely to be known only by the casual references of its members or the untrustworthy utterances of its foes. Hence the difficulty of distinguishing between good evidence and fictitious or exaggerated reports. Allen shows, for example, how political prejudice colored the accounts of the Whig Calves Head Club and the Tory October Club, he discriminates between truth and falsehood in contemporary reports about the Mohocks, and he warns the unwary against a literal acceptance of Ned Ward's *Satyrical Reflections on Clubs*. The fluidity and informality of the club likewise make it difficult to trace the effects of a given group on politics and literature. The exclusiveness of a coterie might obscure the evidence, as with the Saturday Club and the Brothers, the Tory groups of which we hear from Swift. When a really important group like the Scriblerus Club forces itself on our attention, we are caught in an intricate web of biographical and bibliographical problems. Dr. Allen is candid in recognizing these difficulties, and does not do violence to his subject by forcing the evidence in an effort to overcome them. The purely fictitious clubs, including those that figure so largely in the essay periodicals, are more manageable, and the history of this device is here fully and clearly worked out.

Haphazard additions to this well ordered collection of material would be of little worth and would not materially change the conclusions. Because of the importance of the group at Will's, however, some passages in the collection called *A Pacquet from Will's* (1701) should be noted, especially the references to "the Rabble or Witty Club, and the Grave Club" (pp. 49, 56; cf. Allen, p. 31). The *Letters of Wit, Politicks and Morality* (1701) collected by Abel Boyer contains what is said to be a French traveler's account of certain clubs (pp. 215-24). The company at Will's is divided into two groups—"the *Wits*, justly so call'd, and . . . the *Would be-Wits*." Of the Knights of the Toast we are told that their "number is never to exceed Thirteen"; of the Kit-Cat Club, that their "number is about 36, but yet unlimited."

ALAN D. MCKILLOP

The Rice Institute

Germanische Philologie. Ergebnisse und Aufgaben. Festschrift für Otto Behaghel. Hgg. von A. GOTZE, W. HORN, F. MAURER (Germ. Bibl. 1. Abt. 1. Reihe 19). Heidelberg C. Winter, 1934. Pp. viii, 576. RM 20.

Es war ein glücklicher Gedanke der Herausgeber, in der Festschrift zu Behaghels 80. Geburtstag statt loser Beiträge gleichsam einen Querschnitt durch den heutigen Stand germanischer Forschung zu ziehen, wie das zehn Jahre vorher in der Streitberg-Festschrift ganz ähnlich für die Sprachwissenschaft geschehen war. Und zugleich gibt es kaum ein beredteres Zeugnis für die Grösse des nunmehr toten Meisters unserer Wissenschaft als dieses Werk, dessen unerschöpflichem Reichtum eine kurze Anzeige schwerlich gerecht zu werden vermag. Dazu kommt, dass es bei dem grossen Kreise von Schülern und Freunden des Gefeierten ein Leichtes war, für die einzelnen Gebiete Bearbeiter zu finden, die sich nicht mit einem bibliographischen Bericht nur zufrieden gaben.

So enthält schon der erste Aufsatz von K. Wagner über Phonetik, Rhythmik, Metrik neben der Kritik von Neuerscheinungen zugleich einen Versuch, die Lage der heutigen Forschung auf diesem Felde zu kennzeichnen und zu begründen; sie leidet unter der allgemeinen Gewichtsverlagerung vom Studium der Form und ihrer Teile auf Inhalt und Funktion der grosseren Einheiten wie Wort und Satz; zumal gegen die experimentelle Phonetik ist man in Deutschland heute so misstrauisch geworden, dass sie sich nach Wien, Prag und in die Vereinigten Staaten geflüchtet hat.

Ebenso anziehend sind die Ausführungen über Altgermanische Verskunst von H. Kuhn, der insbesondere den verschiedenen Standpunkt von Heusler und Sievers scharfsinnig auseinandersetzt. Dagegen hat H. Arntz sein allerdings besonders schwieriges Kapitel Urgermanisch, Gotisch und Nordisch, zu dem dann in letzter Stunde auch noch die Deutsche Grammatik trat, trotz erstaunlicher Belesenheit nicht ganz gemeistert. Die Anordnung des Stoffes ist mangelhaft, über zu viel Einzelheiten fallen bedeutende Arbeiten oft fast ganz untern Tisch oder werden wie Meillets *Caractères généraux* mit leeren Gemeinplätzen abgetan (S. 50). Immer wieder drängen sich höchst persönliche Werturteile vor, für welche der junge Kritiker die Begründung meist schuldig bleibt. Und was sollen wir gar mit Behauptungen wie: "Das Germanische ist durch die Analyse anschaulicher; das Idg. andererseits war ungeheuer wuchtig und eindrucksvoll" (S. 94)?

Desto trefflicher handelt A. Bach über Deutsche Mundartforschung, für amerikanische Leser eine erwünschte Fortführung der ausgezeichneten Übersicht von C. E. Roedder, "Linguistic Geography," *GL* 1 (1926), 281 ff., ferner W. Will über Namenforschung und A. Götze über Deutsche Wortforschung, dies der

letzte und zuverlässigste Bericht über den Stand der verschiedenen deutschen Wörterbücher und ihre besonderen Ziele.

Die übrigen, vorzüglich unterrichtenden Beiträge können hier leider nur kurz aufgeführt werden. Englische Sprachforschung von W. Horn, Friesisch von F. Holthausen, Deutsche Beowulforschung von W. Fischer, Altdutsche Literaturwissenschaft von G. Ehrismann, Die Mystik von A. Spamer, Humanismus und Reformation von A. E. Berger, dazu mehrere volkskundliche Berichte.

Am stärksten von eigener Gedankenarbeit durchsetzt und gereift sind die Beiträge von J. Trier über Deutsche Bedeutungsforschung, von F. Maurer über die Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache und von F. Stroh über Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft und Sprachphilosophie. Gerade in ihnen offenbart sich ein Zug, der mehr oder weniger bewusst an den verschiedensten Stellen des Werkes hervortritt: die Ausrichtung an grosseren Ganzheiten, die philosophische Besinnung, die gestaltmassige Erfassung im Geiste der Phänomenologie bricht heute wieder, wie in andere Wissenschaften, so auch in die Philologie und ihre Teilgebiete ein, um sie aus wissenschaftlicher und weltanschaulicher Vereinsamung zu erlösen.

Ein genaues Verzeichnis der Schriften Behaghels aus den Jahren 1924-1933 beschliesst den stattlichen Band, der auf Jahre hinaus zu den grundlegenden Werken germanistischer Forschung gehören wird.

OTTO SPRINGER

University of Kansas

Un nouveau principe d'étymologie romane. Par G.-G. NICHOLSON.
Paris: Droz, 1936. Pp. viii + 393.

M. Nicholson vient de publier la troisième série de ses recherches étymologiques (avant-propos p. v), touffues de faits diligemment collectionnés, savamment arrangés, et présentés dans un français impeccable,—mais qui ne peuvent persuader personne. Je crois qu'en somme tous les étymologistes auront approuvé Meyer-Lubke quand il nous apprend dans la 2^{ième} édition de son REW, préface p. xiii: "Nicholson's recherches étymologiques romanes entfernen sich so stark von dem, was für mich die Grundlage aller etymologischen Forschung bildet, dass ich sie gar nicht angeführt habe." M. N. reste imperturbable: "Je réaffirme ces étymologies. A la différence de celles qu'elles remplacent, elles se conforment aux lois de la phonétique, aux exigences du sens commun et aux faits connus ou vraisemblables de l'histoire de la civilisation, triple critère qui seul distingue le vrai du faux." Il faut, pour goûter cette naïveté (qui rappelle un peu la promesse de tel candidat politique à ses électeurs de "faire le bien"!), savoir que les explications que M. N. prétend remplacer par les siennes, émanent

d'étymologistes comme Schuchardt, Meyer-Lubke, Wartburg, Bloch. . . . Je m'étais opposé contre l'étymologie fr *jol* = *diabolivus (d'un *diabolus* évoluant populairement en* *jol*—M. N. revient à la charge en alléguant (p. 18) que le galloroman peut avoir conservé des formes *populaires* de ce mot d'église, qui auraient disparu avant l'époque des documents écrits. Il considère donc un tel raisonnement, qui fait fi du réel et de l'attesté, compatible avec les lois de la phonétique, le bon sens et l'histoire de la civilisation—comment lui faire comprendre que son esprit a d'autres conceptions du bon sens que le reste des romanisants? Le nouveau principe d'étymologie romane qu'il prétend avoir découvert, est celui-ci (p. 2): "Lorsque dans un composé dont le peuple ne reconnaît plus les éléments composants, la syllabe initiale revêt la forme d'un représentant de l'un des préfixes *ab*, *ex*, *in*, *sub*, la conscience du langage l'identifie avec le préfixe dont elle est homonyme et, ce préfixe n'ayant aucune fonction à remplir dans le composé, en opère aussitôt l'aphérèse." P. ex.: fr. *bramer* (dit du cerf en rut), ital. *bramare* 'désirer ardemment' serait un *super-amare* (prov. *sobramar* 'aimer à l'excès'), dans lequel le peuple aurait cru reconnaître *sub*- > *so*- et dont il aurait déduit par aphérèse *-bram*-. Pour M. N. il paraît que le nexus *-per-* en italien donne, comme en provençal, *-br-* (pourtant *supra* > *sopra* et *operat* > *opera*). Il est tout à fait évident pour lui qu'un mot attesté seulement dans la langue si raffinée des troubadours reflète un lat. *vulgaire* **super-amare* et que la famille *-bram-* peut sortir, par méconnaissance, de cet étymon construit, il lui paraît évident aussi qu'un sens 'mugir dans l'état de rut' (dit d'animaux) peut se développer d'un sens si abstrait et si abstraitement exprimé comme 'aimer excessivement'; il ne sent pas l'abîme qui sépare le rut de la bête de l'amour 'supérieur' des troubadours, qui conduit tout droit, par la *gari sciensa*, au surhomme goethéen et nietzschéen.¹ Et la tentative de voir dans le cri animal le sens primitif et de reconduire la famille de mots à un étymon désignant un cri, lui semble insensée. A M. N. il semble plus naturel et plus sensé d'expliquer le fr. argotique *brifer* 'manger gloutonnement' par **super-ürere* > **berürere* etc., que par l' "épouvantail étymologique," l'onomatopée figurée

¹ Si M. Nicholson était tant soit peu "philologue" et non pas ce linguiste "pur", insensible aux valeurs littéraires d'un texte, il aurait saisi le raffinement précieux d'un texte comme celui d'Arnaut Daniel (Rayn II, 67) avec ses jeux de mots, ses allitérations et ses assonances tourmentées:

Sols sui que sai lo sobrafan que m sortz

Al cor, d'amor sofren per sobramar.

Je prévois que M. N. dans sa quatrième série, qui ne tardera pas, va m'opposer le fr. dial. *ameur* 'amour sensuel des bêtes'—mais 1) est-ce que *sobr-amar* est la même chose que *amar*?, 2) il ne faut pas oublier que, comme toujours chez M. N., il y a cumul de difficultés. méconnaissance de *super-* (ce qu'il veut prouver) + un développement sémantique étonnant, qui détruit la valeur de la preuve + développement de *-per-* ital. en *-br-* etc.

par le schéma *brf chez Meyer-Lubke et Wartburg. Instinctivement poussé par la fièvre constructoïde, M. N. ne sent la moindre horreur devant les épouvantails qu'il façonne lui-même de toutes pièces. *bassus* 'bas' issu de *(a)bassare = *ab-assare = *ab-assessare, de *assessus*, *assidere*; *bretèche* de *supertestica, a. fr. *brehaigne* de *supervacu-anea; *trouver* de *interrogare*, *pisser* de *erspincicare 'détacher les grains des épis' etc. C'est cette attitude présomptueuse du constructiviste ne reculant devant aucune *vezata quaestio* et devant aucun tortillement du lexique latin, dont feu Sainéan a écrit la satire anticipée. Comme on devait s'y attendre, on voit l'esprit massif de M. N. chamailler contre l'esprit le plus fin que nous ayons possédé en linguistique romane, Schuchardt, et se moquer d'une page classique de ce grand observateur, tout en n'en saisissant ni la portée philosophique ni même le sens élémentaire (p. 3-4). Et, pour lasser entièrement la patience du lecteur, ce médiocre étymologiste ira comparer, d'après le critérium de l'admission ou non-admission des explications par onomatopées et croisements de mots, l' "œuvre de philologues allemands, surtout de Schuchardt, dont la façon de impressionner . . ." etc., à celle des "romanistes de race latine, amis des réalités"—je me demande pourquoi Sainéan, de race juive, donc, je suppose, réaliste, et, je pense aussi, nullement imbu de méthodes allemandes, a eu le tort d'invalider la théorie ethnique de M. N. en se faisant, durant toute sa vie, l'avocat des onomatopées et des croisements, "sources indigènes" et éternellement créatrices des langues. Ce qui m'étonne de mon côté chez M. Nicholson, c'est, chez un Britannique, ce manque absolu d'ironie vis-à-vis de ses propres "découvertes"—mais je dois reconnaître son talent indiscutable de trouver des éditeurs.

LEO SPITZER

The Johns Hopkins University

Richelieu et Corneille. La Légende de la persécution de l'auteur du Cid. Par LOUIS BATIFFOL. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1936. Pp. x + 199.

Le Manuscrit des Plaintes d'Acante de Tristan l'Hermite. Par EUGÉNIE DROZ. Paris, 25 rue de Tournon, 1937. Pp. 26.

Madame de Sévigné. By ARTHUR TILLEY. Cambridge. University Press [New York: Macmillan], 1936. Pp. xii + 160. \$2.25.

Louis XIV d'après les pamphlets répandus en Hollande. Par P. J. W. VAN MALSEN. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, n. d. Pp. 226.

M. Batiffol has expanded and popularized the evidence he published in the *Rddm* of April 1, 1923, to the effect that Richelieu

was not jealous of Corneille and that he did not desire the Academy to condemn the *Cid*. He shows abundantly that the Cardinal's attitude towards the dramatist was that of a protector rather than that of a rival, that his acceding to Scudéry's appeal to the Academy is no proof that he sought a hostile judgment, and that the legend of persecution was begun by Pellisson, who came to Paris too late to know the facts. With M. B.'s contention I am in general agreement, but I wish that he had taken into consideration such objections as those raised by M. Collas¹ in the *Revue de Paris* of Feb. 1, 1929. There can be no doubt that Chapelain thought Richelieu wanted an unfavorable judgment. One has only to read his letter of July 31, 1637, to be sure of the fact. M. B. is convinced that Chapelain was mistaken and I think it probable that he is right, but the letter should have been discussed and explained. At any rate those who differ with M. B. will do well to read his book.²

The MS. of Tristan's poem was unknown to Bernardin when he wrote the standard work on the author and to Madelin when he published the verses. It was purchased in 1936 by an amateur who allowed Mlle Droz to examine it and to reproduce the covers and a miniature of the Countess of Bergh. Her study of the MS. shows that the poem was written in order that the Duke of Bouillon might present it to this countess, whom he subsequently married. The variants collected by Mlle Droz prove that Tristan revised more extensively than M. Madelin believed. The pamphlet is beautifully printed and the illustrations do justice to the work of art that, according to the description of it, the MS. must be.

Mr. Tilley has added to his many works dealing with the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries this pleasant volume devoted to "some aspects" of his heroine's "life and character." He takes up especially her methods of ascertaining and communicating news, her friendships, her home, her love of nature, and her books. He is thoroughly in sympathy with the charming letter-writer, giving many examples of her vivacity and expression of feeling, quoting,

¹ M. Collas has recently repeated his arguments in a reply to M. Batiffol published in *RHL*, XLIII, 568-72. Space does not allow me to repeat here the objections I raised to M. C.'s interpretation of the documents in my *History of French Dramatic Literature*, Part II, pp. 135-8.

² The dates assigned by B to Mairret's plays are those given them by the frères Parfaict and long ago shown to be erroneous. On p. 57 there is a curious slip: "Giovedì VIII" is translated "le samedi 8." Though the book appeared in 1936, B is convinced, I am glad to note, that *le Cid* was first played in January, 1637. The 7th is, however, not so likely as the 9th, for plays were seldom given on Wednesdays and Friday was the usual day for new plays. He might have added that the only evidence for 1636 comes from the frères Parfaict, who would probably have given 1637 if they had seen Chapelain's letter of Jan. 22. It is thanks to them that 1636 got into the text-books and even upon the stamp issued in honor of the *Cid*'s tercentenary. Even M. Blum's government could be traditionalist!

too, Faguet's reference to her "smiling resignation to evil." Of this last quality her calling la Champmeslé "ma belle-fille" would have been a good example. He spares us the fact that the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes met with her unqualified approval. His portrayal well represents, however, her leading characteristics and will serve as a good introduction to her extensive correspondence.³

In the last of these four books the author sketches Louis XIV's foreign policies and studies in detail the reaction of his enemies expressed in hundreds of pamphlets published in Holland. He adds biographical notes, so far as the authors can be identified, and a list of the pamphlets. The work is carefully and intelligently done. It reveals the tremendous hostility awakened by Louis's wars of conquest and by the Revocation. One notes that, as the years pass, the Dutch become more confident in their resources. The satire, while in the main justified, often exaggerates and becomes at times obscene. Among the French men of letters who contributed to the *corpus* were Furetière, Courtilz de Sandras, and Jurieu. The book makes an interesting contribution to the history of relations between France and the Netherlands in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

The Concept of Nature in Nineteenth-Century English Poetry. By JOSEPH WARREN BEACH. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1936. Pp. xii + 618. \$5.00.

No brief review can do justice to the brilliance, breadth, and erudition of this survey of the history of the philosophical concept of Nature in nineteenth-century poetry. Professor Beach traces the rise of this idea from Shaftesbury through Wordsworth, Shelley, and Coleridge, discusses its height in Emerson and Whitman, and its fall from Arnold to Hardy. The romantic nature cult is viewed as a substitute faith for Christianity which formed a bridge from orthodox religious views to the agnosticism or unbelief characteristic of the present time. The cult, which tended on the whole to conceive of God as a divine "principle" immanent in the universe and in process of realization there, synthesized two elements (1) the scientific notion of regular and universal laws, (2) the religious view of divine providence. It was Shaftesbury who first achieved the "aesthetic synthesis," that is, combined love of rural nature with the scientific concept of universal nature, it was he who first

³ The French quotations deserved more careful proof-reading. The worst slips I have noted are p. 27, *le* for *la lui*; p. 43, *oblîges* for *oblîger*, p. 45, *qui* for *que*; p. 92, *si* for *ri*; p. 106, *procède* for *procédé*.

gave striking imaginative expression to how one may rise from a contemplation of natural scenery, through the concept of Universal Nature, to a knowledge of the Supreme Being as the soul diffused through the whole.

An illuminating chapter on the philosophical background of the nineteenth-century nature poets precedes a discussion of the religious views—of necessarianism, benevolence, design, universal love—and the failure of naturalism in Wordsworth and Shelley. Nearly half of the book is devoted to these problems. Transcendentalism in Carlyle, Coleridge, Emerson, culminating in Whitman, the second phase of the nature cult, was important in the history of liberalism because under its cover naturalism was enabled to make great advances. In the third phase of the movement Darwinian evolution played the leading role: Arnold and Tennyson doubted the beneficence of nature, which Wordsworth, Shelley, and the Transcendentalists unquestioningly assumed; Browning, by rejecting such ideas as the derivation of higher forms of life from lower ones by a process of natural selection, retained the optimism of the early century; Swinburne rejected the supernatural interpretation of man and man's spirit; Meredith's position was much like Swinburne's, he accepted the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest, feeling that hard conditions of life have given man the means of developing his faculties; Hardy sounded the death knell of English nature poetry, the evidence of evolution being for him proof of the blundering ineptitude of Nature or God in that it has occasioned untold suffering to both man and the lower animals. In contemporary poetry the philosophical concept of Nature, as if the literary mind is loath to grapple with cosmic problems, has virtually disappeared.

No doubt specialists in the different poets considered in this work will find errors and omissions, but such faults will assume relative unimportance when the scope of the work is considered. It is indeed uncommon to find a book devoted to so fresh an idea and so large a problem hitherto almost ignored. On the whole the differences between the nature poets are sharpened up in a way that has never been done before. One often wishes that Mr. Beach had developed certain ideas somewhat further, or had made a little clearer the complexities and inconsistencies in the work of any one poet, until one remembers that in writing so comprehensive a book it is often necessary to oversimplify for the sake of clarity and brevity—the main argument must be kept as clear and unencumbered as possible.

It is also inevitable that the chapters should be somewhat uneven; those on Emerson, Whitman, Tennyson, Browning, Swinburne, Meredith, and Hardy are excellent, the one on Shelley based on too superficial study (as Mr. Beach himself does not fail to note), the one on Carlyle too dependent on secondary material. Most interesting of all are the chapters on "The Metaphysical Concept

of Nature" and those on Wordsworth. Professor Beach is indeed gifted in his explanation of technical philosophy and in presenting the issues significant in the study of literature. While he does not trace fully the development of Platonism from antiquity to the romantics—that also would be without the scope of his book—he carries through certain ideas such as "plastic nature," shows how they developed in the seventeenth-century Platonists, More, Cudworth, and others, and were repeated with variations in Newton, Locke, Berkeley. His explanation of the three-fold nature of the conception of the *anima mundi* will do much to clear up confusions on that subject. The chapters on Wordsworth, in addition to their place in the survey, form one of the most significant contributions to the study of Wordsworth's thought yet published. Questions of Wordsworth's development, of the failure of his naturalism, of the relation between his animism and pantheism, of the meaning of such difficult passages as "To every Form of being is assigned . . . An active Principle," "Blest the infant Babe . . . Nursed in his Mother's arms" are most convincingly treated. Moreover, the main approach to Wordsworth's thought, the method of presenting metaphysical problems as they appeared to Wordsworth is admirable. There is always a nice balance between the philosophical idea and the poetic expression of it, always a careful distinction between mere logical consistency in the poetry and an earnest searching for the character of idea congenial to Wordsworth's temperament.

Mr. Beach collects, in many instances for the first time in any place, the significant bibliographical references which any student interested in kindred subjects must consult. The book abounds in well-chosen significant quotations, many from books not readily available.

ADELE B. BALLMAN

Baltimore

Plays about The Theatre in England from The Rehearsal in 1671 to the Licensing Act in 1737. Or, The Self-Conscious Stage and its Burlesque and Satirical Reflections in the Age of Criticism.
By DANE FARNSWORTH SMITH. London and New York:
Oxford University Press, 1936. Pp. xxiv + 292. \$4.00.

Illusion is the thing if great imaginative drama is to succeed in the theater. This is one lesson at least that the reader learns from Mr. Dane F. Smith's *Plays about the Theatre*. By making a study of about seventy plays and scenes, Mr. Smith has produced a picture not easily improved upon of the forces which make for the decay of great drama. His method has been to quote at length from the plays themselves, so that on reading the book one has almost the feeling of having read several dozen plays, burlesques,

and farces, and of having gained a thorough first-hand acquaintance with the Restoration and early eighteenth-century theater. Indeed, although Mr. Smith has introduced with explanations and comments each play and each passage which he quotes, he has depended on the words of the playwrights themselves to present the evidence and to convince the reader of the tendencies of the period under consideration. He shows clearly how the public was disillusioned concerning the whole theatrical business by critics who, not realizing that illusion is all, carped over every slight deviation from arbitrarily imposed dramatic forms and who also demanded turns of wit in every line rather than the expression of human feelings. The extreme case comes in Thomas D'Urfey's *The Fool Turn'd Critic* (1676) when Tim, the young heir to Old Winelove, tells of having hissed off the stage the product of ten months' work for reasons which he cannot remember.

The critics of "The Age of Reason" did not submit themselves to the magic of the stage. Nor is an explanation hard to find why they were not caught in the spell cast by the sight of great kings or inspired fools, of powerful villains or abused beauties. As one learns from these plays about the theater, the audience knew—as no audience ever has a right to know—that in very truth the kings were merely their coffee-house companions, the fools their old cronies, the villains not really wicked but men much like themselves, and the beauties, indeed, ladies of their too intimate acquaintance. Samuel Pepys, in a passage which Mr. Smith might have cited for evidence outside the plays, attests the familiarity of the spectators with the players:

. . . to the women's shift, where Nell was dressing herself, and was all unready, and is very pretty, prettier than I thought. And so walked all up and down the house above, and then below into the scene-room, and there sat down, and she gave us fruit, and here I read the questions to Knepp, while she answered me, through all her part of 'Flora's Figary's' which was acted to-day. But, Lord! to see how they were both painted would make a man mad, and make me loath them, and what base company of men comes among them, and how lewdly they talk! and how poor the men are in clothes, and yet what a shew they make on the stage by candle-light, is very observable. But to see how Nell cursed, for having so few people in the pit, was pretty. By and by into the pit, and there saw the play, which is pretty good, but my belly was full of what I had seen in the house . . . (October 5, 1667)

No doubt many another man had his "belly full" after too easy association with both men and women behind the scenes. When we cannot be enchanted, we can only be made to laugh. Hence, in this age, comedy flourished, but even it lost its high character in the burlesques and farces of disillusionment.

For nearly three-quarters of a century the authors of plays about the theater revealed and ridiculed the art which they professed. Under such an attack on dramatic illusion, the tradition of imaginative drama which they had inherited from Shakespeare and his

associates withered and died. In its place a new tradition grew up, but the sweep of Elizabethan poetry was never again to be recaptured.

Rutgers University

RUDOLF KIRK

John Ford. By M. JOAN SARGEANT. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1935. Pp. 232.

This new monograph will quickly become the chief authority on John Ford. Since this is so, the faults it possesses must be clearly pointed out. Miss Sargeant has been unwise to accept (p. 21) Fleay's old heresy of an early date (1625-28) for the composition of *'Tis Pity* (published 1633). Reducing Fleay's argument to its strongest item, he claims that a passage of Ford's dedication to the Earl of Peterborough means to say the play is his earliest:

Your Noble allowance of *These First Fruits* of my leasure in the Action, emboldens my confidence, of your as noble construction in this Presentment. especially since my Service must euer owe particular duty to your Fauours, by a particular Ingagement.

Miss Sargeant admits the difficulties that arise: is *'Tis Pity* then earlier than a group of plays that Ford wrote in collaboration (1621-24) and his early non-dramatic writings (e.g., *Fame's Memorial*, 1606)? She leaves these "out of account"! Is *'Tis Pity* earlier than the non-extant *An ill beginning has a good end* . . . , (probably) acted at court in 1613? She tries to disqualify the latter by supposing that it may also have been written in collaboration (p. 21). Chronologies cannot be proved by guesswork.

What then does the famous phrase "*These First Fruits* of my leasure" mean? Clearly "leasure" is the crux of the matter: *'Tis Pity* is the first fruit of a period of leisure following some employment, perhaps the "particular Ingagement" in which His Lordship used Ford's services. The dedication, in short, has no chronological significance, unless one can date the period of leisure. In the absence of any strong evidence, one is obliged to be content with the date 1633, determined only by the date of publication.

Related to this matter is Miss Sargeant's preoccupation (pp. 24, 147, 217 n. 2) with Courthope's contention that *'Tis Pity* must be associated with *Love's Sacrifice* in point of composition, and *The Lover's Melancholy* with *The Broken Heart*; the first pair being labelled "domestic melodrama," the latter "the abstract manner." Granted that there are some similarities (e.g., of atmosphere, setting, use of feminine endings) which support this notion, the distinctions disappear under careful scrutiny: there is plenty of melodrama in *The Broken Heart* and plenty of abstraction in *'Tis Pity*. Courthope is one of the weakest reeds, when it comes to the

interpretation of Ford. S. P. Sherman, whom Miss Sargeaunt has read too superficially (pp. 111-12, 140-41), and Havelock Ellis, for whose brilliant and compact analyses she has the proper respect (pp. 55-6), are better guides.

It has become customary to accuse Ford of incompetence in structure and inconsistency in character drawing. A critic will, like Miss Sargeaunt, testify to "the remarkable individuality of his genius," to "his unique artistry" (p. 105), only to condemn him for not doing the ordinary thing. The "silly and rather indecent" basic idea of *The Fancies* (p. 76), the "unsatisfactory" character of Bassanes in *The Broken Heart* (p. 81), for example, would prove to be examples of his consistency and individuality if viewed in the light of his use of Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*.

To certain books on Ford Miss Sargeaunt has shown herself curiously indifferent. Any examination of Ford's relation to Shakespeare (Chapter V) should mention Max Wolff's *John Ford ein Nachahmer Shakespeares*, and any metrical tabulations (Chapter VII) should recognize Eduard Hannemann's *Metrische Untersuchungen zu John Ford*. She makes no claim that her work is complete, yet such an essay as Miss Cochnower's on Ford's ideas (in *Seventeenth Century Studies*) should be named, as should Bradley and Adams's *Jonson Allusion Book*, which contains a new biographical scrap on Ford.

Minor but annoying faults in the book are: the failure exactly to locate dozens of quotations from the plays which many a reader, less familiar with Ford than she, might be at a loss to find; careless errors in spelling—e. g., "Mauriccio" (p. 22) or "Mauricio" (p. 59), instead of the "Maurucio" required by the quarto of *Love's Sacrifice*.

There are as many phases of her work which deserve commendation. For the first time we are presented with a life of Ford which stands on exhaustive investigation of records in his home county of Devon and in the Middle Temple, where he probably spent a large part of his life. The author's additions to the Ford canon, notably the two pamphlets *Christes Bloodie Sweat* and *The Golden Meane*, are interesting and important. Chapters I and II, treating these matters, supersede all earlier works. In the critical chapters—on Ford as a collaborator, as an independent dramatist, on his settings and his use of verse—many of her comments illuminate and carry conviction, as her defence of Penthea in *The Broken Heart* (pp. 82-4) and her elucidation of the character of Auria, the suspicious husband of the little-read play *The Lady's Trial* (pp. 87-91). These chapters are valuable also for their collecting and counterpoising the extremely variant opinions on Ford. The final chapter, presenting a condensed survey of critical opinion from Edward Phillips to Mr. T. S. Eliot, affords a perspective which helps make this divergence of opinion understandable. The careful bibliography with full collations is a useful assemblage, including all titles

claimed for Ford by scholarship since Sherman's edition of *'Tis Pity* and *The Broken Heart* (1915).

Admirers of Ford will be glad to have it remarked again that Milton in *Paradise Regained* (l. 498) seems to be indebted to Ford for one of his most telling phrases,

and Satan bowing low
His gray dissimulation, disappear'd
Into thin Air diffus'd.

S. BLAINE EWING

University of Kentucky

BRIEF MENTION

Early Victorian Drama (1830-1870). By ERNEST REYNOLDS. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, 1936. Pp. viii + 164. 6s. It is difficult to determine exactly what purpose *Early Victorian Drama* may serve. Though incomplete, its appended list of dramatized fiction is scholarly; but its bibliography is unimportant and its appended biographies of six actors are elementary. On nearly every page are questionable generalizations about the drama, the period, or both. Though recognizing that the Victorian "spirit" affects more than England, Dr. Reynolds seems to sympathize little with even the major Victorian, be he Wagner, Tennyson, or George Eliot, and he dismisses Browning, for example, with casualness and sophistry. Most of the materials of the book are fairly available elsewhere. They are organized to account for an alleged decline of the drama. The reasons usually given for this apparent decline are repeated, though woven in a kind of web to snare the dramatist: imitation, notably of Shakespeare and the Greeks; romantic egotism or "escape"; social or spiritual dis-ease; an uncongenial theatre. The most emphasized and perhaps wrongest reason suggested is a kind of encyclopaedic expansiveness, not of form but affecting it, called want of restraint. Quintessential in the major works of all the major Victorians (take them or leave them), this quality seems to me an honorable, often fine, form-changing reach for a no-longer provincial universe. It becomes dramatic in Ibsen, O'Neill, Shaw, and Galsworthy, and was therefore not *per se* inimical to drama.

As a matter of fact, drama did not decline, and the reasons for the failures of individuals to write great plays were personal. In looking for what was not in the Victorian theatre, Dr. Reynolds may have missed seeing what was on its bills. For example, like Nicoll and like Sawyer in *The Comedy of Manners*, he looks vainly for a comedy of manners. But though he is convinced that drama

has flourished only "when literature was practised as an art, and not used as the medium for ethical or sociological propaganda" (p. 7) and though he consistently laments imitativeness, he defines the genre as of the Restoration theatre. Though we dislike comedies of sentiments, in the era of "friendship cards" and "nice Nellies," of "little Women" and "blots on 'scutcheons," the domestic comedies of Knowles, Bulwer, and Robertson were doubtless as authentic comedies of manners as those of Etherege, probably less derivative, more reflective of *general* manners than the caviar-to-the-general Restoration pieces. Of course they were probably Victorian. But as such they may be worth regard.

Duquesne University

ARTHUR E. DUBOIS

The School of Night A Study of the Literary Relationships of Sir Walter Raleigh. By M. C. BRADBROOK. Cambridge (England): At the University Press; New York: Macmillan, 1936 Pp. viii + 190. \$2.25. The reader who expects to find in Miss Bradbrook's slender volume new evidence for the existence of The School of Night will be disappointed. The first two chapters are, for the most part, a composite for the conjectures of Arthur Acheson (*Shakespeare and the Rival Poet*), Professors Quiller-Couch and Wilson (*Love's Labour's Lost*, 1923), and Mr. G. B. Harrison (*Willobie His Avis*). But here these conjectures become historical facts. The author states definitely that "The School of Night" was Shakespeare's nickname for a society which was founded by Raleigh (p. 7).

The third chapter discusses "the doctrine" of the school. "Scepticism," we are told, "left the school with no alternative to a Transcendental God. . . . The necessity for a Transcendental God was due to the sudden enlargement of the universe, as the telescope of Harriot revealed it. . . . The School of Night therefore sought 'a Philosophic Theology' . . ." They began with the stoicism of Plutarch and Seneca, they were influenced by Heraclitus of Ephesus, they dabbled in the occult, they were interested in astronomy, and they borrowed as much of the doctrine of Machiavelli as they needed—but what "doctrine" was evolved from all this the chapter does not make clear.

Miss Bradbrook devotes her next three chapters to a discussion of some of the works of Raleigh, Marlowe, and Chapman. These writings reflect, in her opinion, the theories and activities of The School of Night. Miss Bradbrook's analyses are always stimulating, and her conclusions are often startling. Her main thesis seems to be that the interest of Raleigh, Marlowe, and Chapman in the new philosophy and science caused the language of their poetry to become "complicated with mythology and symbol, and yet flexible with puns and word-play and new verse forms"; and that this laid

the foundations for the metaphysical poets of the new century. This thesis has already found acceptance in many quarters, but much of the evidence by which Miss Bradbrook now attempts to substantiate it must be rejected as mere conjecture.

The last chapter, which is meant to complement Miss Frances M. Yate's *A Study of Love's Labour's Lost*, deals with the war between Shakespeare and The School of Night. Those readers who enjoy tripping lightly along "the primrose path of conjecture" will find this volume delightful. Those who still believe that literary history is a discipline will find it extremely provocative.

WALTER G. FRIEDRICH

Valparaíso University

Phineas Fletcher: Man of Letters, Science, and Divinity. By ABRAM BARNETT LANGDALE. (Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, No. 125.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1937. Pp. viii + 230. \$3.00. This study of Phineas Fletcher presents an interesting, aggressive personality who never attained his goals in the worldly sense but who produced fine testimonies to his vigor as poet, country person, and scientific enthusiast. Students of seventeenth-century poetry will find here valuable chapters on the influences which formed this little-read poet. Those who are devoted to the English clergy may prick up their ears at the suggestion that *The Way to Blessedness* might well be reprinted and set on the shelves beside Herbert's *Country Parson*. The most absorbed readers, however, will probably be the ones who take for their province the history of the introduction of scientific thought into literature.

Mr. Langdale makes it clear that Fletcher was not only meticulously accurate in his anatomical descriptions of *The Purple Island* but that his knowledge of the human body even went beyond the printed books of 1610, the year in which he wrote his great poem. Indeed, he twice speaks of the circulation of the blood, although Harvey's *Exercitatio* was not to be published until 1628. Mr. Langdale suggests that the poet studied anatomy at Caius and Gonville College, where Harvey may have returned as a lecturer while Fletcher was a student at King's. By some means, at any rate, he learned anatomy at first hand and wrote of the real thing in *The Purple Island*. This circumstance Mr. Langdale considers the most original aspect of the thought of Phineas Fletcher.

Though Mr. Langdale's work is marred by trite expressions and uneven writing (e. g., the opening sentence of the paragraph on page 47 has little to do with what follows in the next two paragraphs), he has made a useful contribution to our understanding of Fletcher, who emerges from the pages of this book as a versatile poet, a scientist eager to accept new discoveries, and a parson who

took his vocation so seriously that he would bother to write a treatise on his parochial duties.

RUDOLF KIRK

Rutgers University

James Thomson's Influence on Swedish Literature in the Eighteenth Century. By WALTER GILBERT JOHNSON. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1936. Pp. 202. (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, xix, Nos. 3 and 4.) \$2.50. Though other scholars had mentioned, either incidentally or with specific examples, Thomson's influence on different Swedish authors in the eighteenth century, Professor Johnson gives a more detailed, consistent, and unified treatment of the whole field, and in so doing performs his greatest service to comparative literature. The works of Dalin, Fru Nordenflycht, Creutz, Gyllenborg, Gothenius (primarily a translator and paraphraser), Bergstrom (translated Thomson's *Agamemnon*), Clewberg-Edelcrantz, Denell (of minor significance only), Oxenstierna, and Franzén are studied. After summarizing Thomson's *Seasons*, *Britannia*, and *Liberty* (pp. 9-33), with running comment, Professor Johnson tackles his specific problem, which is to show how Thomson influenced both nature poetry and "the writing of patriotic poetry" in Sweden. The latter in point of time takes precedence, and Dalin's *Svenska friheten* (1742) is an early example. The Swedish authors apparently made no use of *The Castle of Indolence* or of Thomson's dramas except to translate the *Agamemnon* noted above. The method used in this study is that of parallelism to show the similarity in style or theme, sometimes both. Though the *Seasons* was the most influential poem, Professor Johnson shows that *Liberty* and *Britannia* evidently influenced the patriotic poetry of Dalin, Nordenflycht, Gyllenborg, Oxenstierna, and Clewberg. In this connection he is more convincing when he discusses the influence of *Liberty* on Dalin's *Svenska friheten* (1742) and Clewberg's *Sorge-tal* (1783), and the possible influence of *Britannia* on Nordenflycht's *Det fralsta Svea* (1746) than in the other examples cited.

This study contains a bibliography, an appendix of biographical notes, and an index.

HERBERT DRENNON

*Murray State Teachers College,
Murray, Kentucky*

The Oxford Book of Modern Verse, 1892-1935. Chosen by W. B. YEATS. New York: Oxford University Press, 1936. Pp. xlv + 454. \$3.00. This is an amazingly bad compilation to appear under the editorship of W. B. Yeats. The forty-five page Introduc-

tion is superficial and confused. No critic, however clear-minded, could in so small a space, give a good account of these last forty years of poetry,—and Mr. Yeats, as critic, has always been impressionistic. Furthermore, he seems self-conscious and inhibited, as if the poets he is dealing with were looking over his shoulder and admonishing him. Thus, Edith Sitwell receives a startling amount of attention for so slight and so distorted a talent. Nor are these disproportions of emphasis confined to the preface. The selections from the poets are capricious to the point of eccentricity. I can not feel that either the introduction or the selections were the result of Mr. Yeats's best powers. Even his prose becomes, in spots, quite slovenly. I can not identify with the author of "Ideas of Good and Evil" and the "Trembling of the Veil" a sentence like this: "But every light has its shadow, we tumble out of one pickle into another, the 'pure-gem-like flame' was an insufficient motive; the sons of men who had admired Garibaldi or applauded the speeches of John Bright, picked Ophelias out of the gutter, who knew exactly what they wanted and had no intention of committing suicide." The sentence refers to the aesthetic poets of the 90's by whom Yeats is still, perhaps unconsciously, unduly impressed,—to judge by the amount of space he devotes to them. Two further examples of erratic judgment may be pointed out. Reference is made to Robert Bridges's influence on Laurence Binyon, as if the influence were limited to that one poet, and as if, had it been so limited, it would have been worth mentioning at all. Arthur Waley and Tagore are lumped together; and in the text Tagore is represented by seven pieces, and Waley with but one. These instances must suffice to illustrate the hopeless confusion of the ideas expressed in the introduction, and the extraordinary ineptitude of the compilation itself.

ROBERT HILLYER

Harvard University

A Bibliography of British History (1700-1715). With Special Reference to the Reign of Queen Anne. By WILLIAM THOMAS MORGAN. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1934. Volume I (1700-1707). Pp. xviii + 524. (Nos. 94 and 95, Indiana University Studies.) Professor Morgan is well known to historians for his work on *English Political Parties and Leaders in the Reign of Queen Anne* (1920). His present volume is the first installment of a bibliography of the books and pamphlets printed in the period from 1700 to 1715. His primary interest is in political, economic, and social history, and his bibliography is intended to be of service mainly in those fields. But within its limitations it will be indispensable for investigators in this period.

LOUIS I. BREDVOLD

University of Michigan

Der Dichter Tannhauser. Leben—Gedichte—Sage. Von JOHANNES SIEBERT. Halle: Max Niemeyers Verlag, 1934. The editor of this edition of the poems of the M. H. G. poet Tannhauser shows marked devotion to all phases of his task. The first part treats of the 'Dichter,' the second of the 'Gedichte,' with the subtitles 'Metrische Einführung, Text, Anmerkungen, und Erläuterungen,' the third of 'die Sage.' The text editing seems to have been done with care and the 'Anmerkungen' are particularly copious and of special importance for poetry of the type of the 'Tannhauser.' As to the *Hofzucht*, a conventional product, it seems to this reviewer that it is not by Tannhauser, to judge by sound-conditions, while the 'Busslieder' of the Jenaer and Kolmarer Handschrift are distinctly of the same type as the poems of C (Manessische Liederhandschrift, Heidelberg), the authority for the generally accepted work of the poet. An exception should be made in case of 3, stanza 2. Of the rest of the poetry only pp. 227-231 could be considered as Tannhauser's. If these statements be correct they would be of significance for the biography of the poet. An excellent account of the works is found in Ehrismann's *Geschichte der Deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters*, 1935, pp. 265-267. It appears this poet, though of secondary importance, well deserved a new edition. As to the music attributed to Tannhauser a composer of national reputation, to whom it was submitted, informed the reviewer that it would be effective when sung by a modern mass chorus.

FREDERICK H. WILKENS

New York University

George and Sarah Green, A Narrative. By DOROTHY WORDSWORTH. Edited by ERNEST DE SELINCOURT. Oxford: Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford University Press], 1936. Pp. 91. \$2.00. This is a Lyrical Ballad in prose, an admirably simple and direct account of the death of a very poor dalesman and his wife, of their funeral, and of placing five of the youngest children with various neighbors in the valley. Professor de Selincourt adds many details, giving the later history of the children and telling how the £500 raised for them (much of it by the Wordsworths) was spent. The Greens' attachment to their "morsel of Land" which had been in the family for generations (pp. 48, 75) recalls "Michael."

R. D. H.

Errata: P. 20, l. 12 should be followed immediately by ll 2 and 3 of note 6; p. 187, note 1, l. 3, *read* i ure; p. 523, l. 40, *read* Monchischen

INDEX

SUBJECTS

- Académie de Dijon
 Au Temps de l'Encyclopédie, l'—
 — de 1740 à 1793 286, Les
 Concurrents de J-J Rousseau à
 l'— — — pour le Prix de 1754
 286
- Adam de la Halle *Esprec in Le
 Jeu de la Feuillée* 262.
- Addison and the Pleasures of the
 Imagination 498
- Aesthetics Literatur- und Kunst-
 kritik in ihren Wechselbeziehung-
 en. ein Beitrag zur englischen
 Asthetik des 18 Jahrhunderts 231
- Alain de Lille, The *Anticlaudian* of
 —, Prologue, Argument and Nine
 Books Translated, with an Intro-
 duction and Notes 233
- Alfred, A Curious Blunder in Some
 Modern English Translations of
 King —'s Version of Bede's His-
 tory 412
- Alighieri, Dante, see Dante
- Alliterative Poetry in M. E.: A Sur-
 vey of the Traditions 430.
- Allot, Robert. Notes on *Englands
 Parnassus* 402.
- American Ballads East Tennessee
 and Western Virginia Mountain
 Ballads 150
- American Criticism, Paul Elmer
 More and 71
- American Drama A History of the
 Philadelphia Theatre 1835 to 1855
 75.
- American-German Relations. Liter-
 ary Pioneers. Early American Ex-
 plorers of European Culture 154;
 see also German Literature.
- American Novel, A Bibliography of
 the — — through 1850 234
- American Short Story. America
 Through the Short Story 457
- anachronism* 120
- Ancients and Moderns A Study of
 the Background of the *Battle of
 the Books* 447.
- Anglo-German Relations: Bristols
 Bedeutung für die englische Ro-
 mantik und die deutsch-englischen
 Beziehungen 466; see also German
 Literature.
- Anglo-Irish Relations. Ireland
 Through Tudor Eyes 467.
- Anglo-Norman, Passages from the
 — Book of Kings 260.
- Anglo-Saxon
 A History of the —s 510; The
 Larger Rhetorical Patterns in —
 Poetry 132, see also Old English.
- Anglo-Scandinavian Relations, see
 English-Scandinavian Relations.
- Antichrist, The Play of — from the
 Chester Cycle 156.
- Arbuthnot, John —, Mathematician
 and Satirist 222.
- Ariosto Les Imitations de l'Arioste
 de P. Desportes 460
- Arnold, Matthew, Studies in the
 Text of —'s Prose Works 536
- Association Canado-Américaine, The
 Library of the 542
- bail*, see *common bail*.
- ballast-hill* 509
- Balzac, A New Source for
Contes érolatiques 419
- Bandello and "Clizia" 38
- Banville, Théodore de, La Pratique
 et la théorie du *rondeau* et du
rondelet chez 235
- Bathurst, Theodore: *Lycidas* and
 the Translation of "May" 398
- Baudelaire, *Flowers of Evil* 453.
- Beddoes, Thomas Lovell
 The Browning Box, or the Life
 and Works of — as reflected in
 letters by his friends and ad-
 mirers 149; The Works of 306
- Bede, A Curious Blunder in Some
 Modern English Translations of
 King Alfred's Version of —'s
 History 412
- Beowulf*
 A Note on the Helm in 34; Zur
 Vorgeschichte des 374.
- Bibliography, The Beginning of Sys-
 tematic — 151.
- Blackfriars Theatre, Production and
 Stage-Management at the 526.
- Boldieri, Gherardo. Bandello and
 "Clizia" 38.
- bridegroom* 509.

- Bristols Bedeutung für die englische Romantik und die deutsch-englischen Beziehungen 466
- British History, A Bibliography of — (1700-1715) 76, 619
- Browning
The — Box, or the Life and Works of Thomas Lovell Beddoes as reflected in letters by his friends and admirers 149; Porphyria's Lover 579.
- Brunetière, Ferdinand —, the Evolution of a Critic 290
- Brydges, Sir Samuel Egerton, The Literary Career of 147
- Bulkeley, Mr — and the Pirate, a Welsh Diarist of the 18th Century 542.
- Bunyan, John — Mechanick Preacher 64
- Butti, E. A. A Possible Source for —'s *Castello del Sogno* 256.
- Byron, The Publication Date, and Source of —'s "Translation of a Romance Love Song" 503.
- Canadian-French: The Library of the Association Canado-Américaine 542
- Carols, The Early English — 125
- Celtic Poetry. Studies in Early Celtic Nature Poetry 307.
- Chain of Being, see Great Chain of Being.
- Chapman, George
—'s Fortune with Winged Hands 190; The Date of *Revenge for Honour* 192; Elizabethan Comic Conventions as Revealed in the Comedies of 437.
- Chaucer
A — Allusion 568; — and Aulus Gellius 347; — at Work on the Complaint in the *Franklin's Tale* 16; —'s *Book of the Duchess* and Two of Granson's *Complaintes* 487; —'s *Taillynge ynough* 570; A B Version of the Legend Told by —'s Prioress 23; The Education of 464; Gawain in the *Squire's Tale* 413; The Miller's Head 417, The Monk's Tale, A Mediaeval Sermon 570; A New Lydgate — MS. 1; Old Age in —'s Day 25; On the Subtly Creeping Wine of —'s Pardoner 27; *The Pardoner's Tale* 379; Roger de Ware, Cook 491; Spring in — and Before Him 9; A 13th Century —ian Analogue 28, An Uncollected 16th Century Allusion to *The House of Fame* 31, An Unusual Meaning of "Make" in 351
- Chester Cycle, The Play of Antichrist from the 156
- Chesterfield
— 451; Some Early Verses by 411
- Chivalry, "Reaving the Dead" in the Age of 353.
- Chrétien de Troyes On the Date of the *Lancelot* 172.
- Chronicle*, The Parker — (832-900) 381
- Churchyard, Thomas, Notes on the Bibliography of 180.
- Chifford, Sir Lewis —'s French Mission of 1391 33
- "Clizia," see Boldieri, Gherardo.
- Clubs of Augustan London, The 602
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor
— A selected bibliography of the best available editions of his writings, of biographies and criticisms of him, and of references showing his relations with contemporaries 75, — and Schelling's Treatise on the Samothracian Deities 162.
- common bail* 509.
- Cooper, James Fenimore, New Letters from 117.
- Corneille, Pierre
Les Débuts de 53, Deux Classiques français vus par un critique étranger. — et son temps; Molière 53; Richelieu et —. La Légende de la persécution de l'auteur du *Cid* 607.
- Cornwall, Barry
—: A Biography of Bryan Waller Proctor, with a Selected Collection of Hitherto Unpublished Letters 73; The Literary Recollections of 154
- Corsica, see Italian
- Courtesy Literature, Gentlefolk in the Making Studies in the History of English — and Related Topics from 1531 to 1774 593.
- Courtly Love: The Allegory of Love. a Study in Medieval Tradition 515
- Crashaw, Richard —. A Study in Style and Poetic Development 387.

Criticism: Evolution and Repentance 76

Cruz, Ramón de la, The Naive Theme in *The Tempest* as a Link between Thomas Shadwell and 252.

Dante

"Letargo" (*Par*, XXXIII, 94) 469, St Jerome and the First Terzina of the *Divine Comedy* 259

Davenant, Sir William —'s *Gondibert*, its Preface, and Hobbes's Answer A Study in English Neo-Classicism 231

Dekker, Zur Verfasserfrage des —schen Stückes *The Pleasant Comedy of Old Fortunatus* 526

Deloney, Thomas Two Notes 103

Deor 129.

De Quincey

—, A Biography 452; — at Work 308, Is — the Author of *The Love-Charms*? 389.

Desportes, P, Les Imitations de l'Arïoste de 460.

Dickens, see English Novel

Dijon, see Académie de Dijon.

Dillon, George, see Authors of Articles and of Books Reviewed.

Dorset *The Complaint of Henry Duke of Buckingham*, Including the *Induction*, or Thomas Sackville's Contribution to the *Mirror for Magistrates* 466

Drama, see English, French, German Drama.

Drayton, The Relation of —'s "Noah's Flood" to the Ordinary Learning of the Early 17th Century 106

Dreams in O. N. Literature and Their Affinities in Folklore 133

Dryden

— and All Souls 115, — and Eton 111; Pre-Restoration Poetry in —'s Miscellany 545; Scenery for the *Indian Queen* 408, The Sources of —'s Comedies 437.

Elizabethan Books of Devotion, see English Devotional Literature.

Elizabethan Tragedy, see English Drama

Elyot, *Julius Caesar* and —'s *Governour* 407.

Englands Parnassus, see Allot, Robert

English

Annual Bibliography of — Language and Literature 153; An 18th Century Essay on Spelling 209, An Example of Vowel-Harmony in a Young Child 508

English Criticism. The Sublime a Study of Critical Theories in 18th Century England 302

English Courtesy Literature, see Courtesy Literature.

English Devotional Literature Reformation und spanische Andachtsliteratur. Luis de Granada in England 526.

English Drama

Death and Elizabethan Tragedy 437, The Early Middle Class Drama (1696-1774) 140; Early Victorian Drama (1830-1870) 615; Essays in Dramatic Literature. The Parrott Presentation Volume By Pupils of Professor T. M. Parrott 61, Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age 437; The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy 435; Notes on Some 18th Century Dramas 203, Plays about the Theatre in England from *The Rehearsal* in 1671 to the Licensing Act in 1737. Or, The Self-Conscious Stage and its Burlesque and Satirical Reflections in the Age of Criticism 611; The Real War of the Theatres. Shakespeare's Fellows in Rivalry with the Admiral's Men, 1594-1603 Repertories, Devices and Types 59; Das Schauspiel der englischen Komödianten in Deutschland Seine dramatische Form und seine Entwicklung 526; The Theme of Revenge in Elizabethan Tragedy 526

English Essay: The English Familiar Essay in the Early 19th Century 70

English Handwriting, Specimens of 16th Century — — Taken from Contemporary Public and Private Records 74.

English History, see British History and Anglo-Saxon.

English Literature

Annals of — —, 1475-1925 153, Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature 153, Bibliographies of twelve Victorian Authors 458; The Enchanted

- Glass The Elizabethan Mind in Literature 442, Ireland Through Tudor Eyes 467, The Microscope and English Imagination 229, A Reference Guide to the Literature of Travel Volume I (The Old World) 310.
- English Medieval Literature Three Medieval Centuries of Literature in England, 1100-1400 378
- English Novel, The History of the — — Vol 7, The Age of Dickens and Thackeray 309
- English Poetry
— of the 17th Century 468;
Aspects of 18th Century Nature Poetry 302, The Concept of Nature in 19th Century — 609, Enthusiasm in — of the 18th Century (1700-1774) 302, Georgic Tradition in 302, The Oxford Book of Modern Verse, 1892-1935 618, Topographical Poetry in 18th Century England 232
- English Proverbs, The Oxford Dictionary of 433
- English Romanticism Bristols Bedeutung für die englische Romantik und die deutsch-englischen Beziehungen 466
- English - Scandinavian Relations. Literary Relations of England and Scandinavia in the 17th Century 596
- English Theater, see English Drama.
- English Travels, see English Literature.
- Errata 620.
- espino* 262.
- Evelyn, Mr Pepys and Mr. — 220
- Faust, Sources of the — Tradition from Simon Magus to Lessing 521.
- Fiction, Recent Works on Prose — before 1800 580.
- Fletcher, John
— and Massinger's *Little French Lawyer* 406
- Fletcher, Phineas 617.
- Folklore, Dreams in O N Literature and Their Affinities in 133
- Fontenelle, Note on a Letter by 266
- Ford, Charles, The Letters of Jonathan Swift to 298.
- Ford, John 613.
- Forster as Lander's Literary Executor 504
- Franco-American: The Library of the Association Canado - Américaine 542
- French Art- Cinquantenaire du symbolisme, exposition de manuscrits autographes - estampes - peintures-sculptures — éditions rares - portraits - objets d'art 537.
- French Drama
Les Bâtards au théâtre en France de la Renaissance à la fin du 18^e siècle 52, The Conqueror in 17th Century — 45, The Early Middle Class Drama (1696-1774) 140, A History of French Dramatic Literature in the 17th Century, Part III, The Period of Molière, 1652-1672 275; Marionettes in the North of France 311; The People in 17th Century French Tragedy 475.
- French Novel Deux Romans peu connus du 17^e siècle français 482
- French Poetry
Cinquantenaire du symbolisme, exposition de manuscrits autographes - estampes - peintures-sculptures — éditions rares - portraits - objets d'art 537, En Marge de la mêlée symboliste 537, La Poésie française contemporaine, 1885-1935, avec une bibliographie des poètes, une bibliographie des ouvrages généraux, une table analytique des matières et un Index des noms cités 537; Shelley et la France. Lyrisme anglais et lyrisme français au XIX^e siècle 146; Three Centuries of French Poetic Theory, A critical history of the chief Arts of Poetry in France (1328-1630), Chronological Lists of Treatises, Genres of Verses with Anthologies 122
- French Symbolism, see French Art and French Poetry
- Frost, R., see Authors of Articles and of Books Reviewed.
- Galsworthy, Die Technik des realistischen Dramas bei Ibsen und 78.
- Gascoigne and the Oxford Cipher 183.
- Gawain*, see *Sir Gawain*.
- Gellius, Aulus — and Chaucer 347.
- Genlis, Mme de, A Forgotten Participant in the Attack on the Convent: — 89.
- German: Trubners Deutsches Wörterbuch 461.

- German-American Relations, see American-German Relations.
- German Drama
Comedy in Germany in the First Half of the 18th Century 427,
The Early Middle Class Drama (1696-1774) 140
- German-English Relations, see Anglo-German Relations
- Germanic Germanische Philologie Ergebnisse und Aufgaben. Festschrift für Otto Behaghel 604
- German Literary History, The Factor of Generation in 324.
- German Literature
— of the Mid-Nineteenth Century in England and America as Reflected in the Journals 1840-1914 355; Deutsche Studien, Vorträge und Ansprachen 462, Fremdherrschaft und Befreiung 1795-1815 357, Im Neuen Reich 1871-1914 357.
- German Poetry Deutsche Dichtung im Weltkrieg 1914-1918 357
- German Romanticism Krisenjahre der Frühromantik 369
- Gisla saga Súrssonar*, Die Schöpfung der 68
- Gissing, George, *Workers in the Dawn* 76.
- Glapthorne, Henry, see Chapman, George.
- Goethe
— *Kalender auf das Jahr 1937* 521; — in Umwelt und Folgezeit Gesammelte Studien 364; *Faust* 521.
- Goldsmith, An Inconsistency in the Thought of 206.
- Gosson, Spenser and — 574
- Gothic Notes 207.
- Granson, Chaucer's *Book of the Duchess* and Two of —'s *Complaints* 487
- Great Chain of Being. A Study of the History of an Idea 518.
- Grimm, Herman, A Fragment of a Drama by 313.
- Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence, *La Vie de Saint Thomas Becket* 284.
- Guillaume de Dole*, see Jean Renart.
- Harvard Tercentenary Publications.
I. Factors Determining Human Behavior 428.
- Hensel, Luise — als Dichterin 371.
- Hobbes, Sir William Davenant's *Gondibert*, its Preface, and —'s Answer. A Study in English Neoclassicism 231
- Hoskins, John, *Directions for Speech and Style* 444.
- Howard, Henry, see Surrey.
huelh de veure 264
- Hughes, Thomas, Charles Kingsley and —, First Editions 454.
- Human Behavior, Factors Determining — — 428.
- Hunt, Leigh — (1784-1859), Contribution à l'histoire du romantisme anglais 534.
- Ibsen, Die Technik des realistischen Dramas bei — und Galsworthy 78
- Icelandic Sagas, Four 152; see also *Gisla saga Súrssonar*.
- Irving, Washington
A Bibliography of the Writings of —. A Check List 388; The Life of 223.
- Italian
Atlante linguistico-etnografico italiano della Corsica . . . Introduzione 270, Les Raisons et les principaux caractères de l' "Atlante linguistico-etnografico italiano della Corsica" 270.
- Italian Carnival Songs: Canti carnascialeschi del Rinascimento 459.
- Italian Literature: Walter Savage Landor's Studies of Italian Life and Literature 72.
- Jahrbuch des Freien Deutschen Hochstifts*, 1934-1935 521.
- Jansenism, The Origins of 137.
- Jean Renart. Notes sur *Guillaume de Dole* 87.
- Johnson, Samuel
— and English Poetry before 1660 449; —ian Gleanings, Part VII (Jervis, Porter, and other allied families) 449.
- Jonson, Ben
— on the English Stage 1660-1776 437; A MS. Restoration Prologue for *Volpone* 198.
- Keats
—, Complete Poems and Selected Letters 76; The Letters of 153.
- Kingsley, Charles — and Thomas Hughes, First Editions 454.

- Old Icelandic The Problem of Wineland 463
 Old Norse, Dreams in — Literature and Their Affinities in Folklore 133.
 Orinda, see Philips, Katherine.
 Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs 433
- Pardo Bazán, Two Naturalistic Versions of Genesis Zola and 243
 Parker *Chronicle* (832-900) 381
 Pascal, The Revival of —, a Study of His Relation to Modern French Thought 137
 Paul, Jean, see Richter, Johann Paul Friedrich
 Pepys, Mr. — and Mr Evelyn 220
 Philadelphia Theatre, see American Drama.
 Philips, Katherine The Matchless Orinda 116.
pocosi 210
 Pound, Ezra, *Make it New. Essays* 155
 Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity 421
 Proctor, Bryan Waller, see Cornwall, Barry.
 Provençal *huelh de veure* and *sec . . . son agre* 264.
 Pugh, Edwin, The Works of 70
 Purney, Thomas, The Works of 533
 Pushkin 425.
 Puttenham, George, *The Arte of English Poesie* 444.
- Quatre Livres des Reus* 260.
- Racine, The Best plays of 461.
 Raleigh, Sir Walter, The School of Night A Study of the Literary Relationships of 616.
 Renard, Jules
L'Interprétation graphique, cinématographique et musicale des œuvres de 288; L'Œuvre et l'âme de 288.
 Richelieu et Corneille La Légende de la persécution de l'auteur du *Cid* 607.
 Richter, Johann Paul Friedrich Jean Pauls Schulmeister 341
 Robinson, E. A., *King Jasper: a poem* 218
 Roger de Ware, see Ware.
 Romance Etymology: Un Nouveau principe d'étymologie romane 605; see also Language.
- Roper, William, *The Lyfe of Sir Thomas Moore, knyghte* 155.
 Roth, Simon —s Fremdworterbuch 372; see also 506.
 Rousseau, J.-J., Les Concurrents de — à l'Académie de Dijon pour le Prix de 1754 286.
- Sackville, Thomas, see Dorset.
 Sangley, the Merchant-Traveller 189
 Satirical Proclamation, A 172.
 Schelling, Coleridge and —'s Treatise on the Samothracian Deities 162.
 Schillers Urbilder 365.
 Schlegel, Krisenjahre der Fruhmantik Briefe aus dem —kreis 369
 School of Night. A Study of the Literary Relationships of Sir Walter Raleigh 616
sec . . . son agre 264.
segullo 79.
 Senecan Elements in Marston's *Antonio and Melinda* 196.
Seven Sages of Rome, Two Chap-Book Versions of *The* — 494.
 Sévigné, Madame de 607.
 Shadwell, Thomas, The Naïve Theme in *The Tempest* as a Link between — and Ramón de la Cruz 252.
 Shakespeare
 A — Allusion 201; — and The Audience. A Study in the Technique of Exposition 530; — *Jahrbuch*. Bd 71 526; —s Caesarbild 526, —'s Imagery and What It Tells Us 526, —s Sonette in Deutschland 526; *Hamlet* 382, A *Hamlet* Bibliography and Reference Guide 1877-1935 437; *Hamlet* the Man 526; The Janus of Poets, Being an Essay on the Dramatic Value of —'s Poetry Both Good and Bad 526, *Julius Caesar* and Elyot's *Governour* 407; "Lay her a-hold" 96, The MS. of —'s *Hamlet* and the Problems of its Transmission 382; The Naïve Theme in *The Tempest* as a Link between Thomas Shadwell and Ramón de la Cruz 252; A Note on *The Tempest* 200, The Real War of the Theatres. —'s Fellows in Rivalry with the Admiral's Men, 1594-1603 Repertories, Devices and Types 59; Der Sinn des *Hamlet*. Kunstwerk,

- Handlung, *überlieferung* 526, *A Study of Love's Labour's Lost* 437; "Twill be thine another day" 394, *What Happens in Hamlet* 382
- Shelley
— et la France 146, *The Meaning of The Witch of Atlas* 144, *A Source for Portions of The Witch of Atlas* 157
- Sheridan, *The Rivals* 77
- Sidney, Sir Philip — as a Literary Craftsman 445.
- Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*
Blow or Brawn? 36
- Skelton, *The Date of —'s Bowge of Court* 572
- Smollett et la France 66.
- Sonne (Die) geht zu Gnaden* 506
- Speculum Sacerdotale* 601.
- Spenser
— and Gosson 574, — and the System of Courtly Love 55, —'s Theory of Friendship 598, *A Biographical Sketch of John Young, Bishop of Rochester, with Emphasis on His Relations with 55; The Date of —'s View* 176; *Did — Starve?* 400; *Faerie Queene. An Interpretation* 55, *La Gerusalemme liberata* nella Inghilterra di 459; *Lycidas* and the Translation of "May" 398, *Platonic Ideas in 55, Two Centuries of —ian Scholarship* 598, *A View of the Present State of Ireland* 55.
- steel 509.
- Sterry, Peter —, *Platonist and Puritan—1613-1672 A Biographical and Critical Study with Passages selected from his Writings* 423.
- Suckling, *An Answer to —'s "Why so pale and wan, fond lover?"* 410.
- Surrey: *Another Version of "The Things that Cause a Quiet Lyfe"* 186.
- Swedish Literature, James Thomson's Influence on — in the 18th Century 618.
- Swift
—. *Gedanken und Schriften über Religion und Kirche* 298; *Antients and Moderns: A Study of the Background of the Battle of the Books* 447; *The Drapier's Letters to the People of Ireland* 298, *The Letters of — to Charles Ford* 298; *Die Weltanschauung Jonathan —s* 298
- talus 79
- Tannhauser, *Der Dichter — Leben — Gedichte—Sage* 620
- Tasso
Bibliografia analitica tassiana (1896-1930) 540, *French and English Echoes of a Descriptive Passage in 265, La Gerusalemme liberata nella Inghilterra di Spenser* 459.
- Thackeray, see *English Novel*.
- Thibaut de Champagne *The Historical Setting of Robert veez de Peiron* 83
- Thompson, Francis 455.
- Thomson, James
—'s Influence on Swedish Literature in the 18th Century 618; *The Fate of —'s Edward and Eleanor* 500.
- Tieck, Ludwig
—, *The German Romanticist* 295, *Un Poète romantique allemand.* — 367
- traditionalisme 167.
- Tristan l'Hermite, *Le Manuscrit des Plaintes d'Acante* de 607.
- Trübners *Deutsches Wörterbuch* 461
- Vega, see *Lope de Vega*.
- Vigny's "Elévations" 269
- Villon, *Etat présent des études sur* 283
- Voltaire
A Prototype of the Story in Zadig (Ch III): Le Chien et le cheval 576; *Une Source du Zadig* de 268.
- Waldere 129
- Ware, Roger de —, *Cook* 491.
- Whitehead, William —. *Poeta Laureatus, eine Studie zu den literarischen Strömungen um die Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts* 533.
- Widsith 296.
- Wilson, John, *The Cheats* 77
- Wineland, *The Problem of* 463
- Wordsworth, Dorothy, *George and Sarah Green, A Narrative* 620.
- Wordsworth, William
Historic Detail in The Borderers 577; *The Source of —'s "The*

- Force of Prayer" 165, "unimaginable touch of Time" 503.
- Yeats, W. B., see Authors of Articles and of Books Reviewed.
- Young, John, A Biographical Sketch of —, Bishop of Rochester, with Emphasis on His Relations with Edmund Spenser 55.
- Zola, Two Naturalistic Versions of Genesis. — and Pardo Bazán 243.

AUTHORS OF ARTICLES AND OF BOOKS REVIEWED

- Abercrombie, N., The Origins of Jansenism 137.
- Adolf, H. (ed.), Im Neuen Reich 1871-1914 357.
- Aikin-Sneath, B., Comedy in Germany in the First Half of the 18th Century 427.
- Allen, D. C., The Relation of Drayton's "Noah's Flood" to the Ordinary Learning of the Early 17th Century 106.
- Allen, H. B., Shakespeare's "Lay her a-hold" 96.
- Allen, N. B., The Sources of John Dryden's Comedies 437.
- Allen, R. J., The Clubs of Augustan London 602.
- Alspach, R. K., The Matchless Orinda 116.
- Arjona, J. H., La Fecha de *Ejemplo de casadas y prueba de la paciencia* de Lope de Vega 249.
- Armour, R. W., Barry Cornwall A Biography of Bryan Waller Proctor 73; The Literary Recollections of Barry Cornwall (ed.) 154.
- Arndt, K. J. R., New Letters from James Fenimore Cooper 117.
- Arnold, R. F. (ed.), Fremdherrschaft und Befreiung 1795-1815 357.
- Aubin, R. A., Topographical Poetry in 18th-Century England 232.
- Austin, H. D., "Letargo" 469.
- Baesecke, A., Das Schauspiel der englischen Komödianten in Deutschland 526.
- Baker, E. A., The History of the English Novel 309.
- Baldwin, C. S., Three Medieval Centuries of Literature in England, 1100-1400 378.
- Bartlett, A. C., The Larger Rhetorical Patterns in AS Poetry 132.
- Barton, M. N., see Kennedy, V. W.
- Basler, R. P., The Publication Date, and Source of Byron's "Translation of a Romaic Love Song" 503.
- Batiffol, L., Richelieu et Corneille 607.
- Baudin, M., Les Bâtards au théâtre en France de la Renaissance à la fin du 18^e siècle 52; The Conqueror in 17th-Century French Drama 45; The People in 17th-Century French Tragedy 475.
- Beach, J. W., The Concept of Nature in 19th-Century English Poetry 609.
- Beall, C. B., Deux Romans peu connus du 17^e siècle français 482.
- Beattie, L. M., John Arbuthnot 222.
- Becker, P. A., Die Narrenspiele des neunentdeckten Mischbands von Treppereldrucken 311.
- Behaghel, O., see Gotze, A.
- Behrend, F., Deutsche Studien 462.
- Bennett, J. A. W., Dryden and All Souls 115.
- Bennett, J. W., Did Spenser Starve? 400.
- Berendsohn, W. A., Zur Vorgesichte des *Beowulf* Mit einem Vorwort von Professor O. Jespersen 374.
- Bernbaum, E., Recent Works on Prose Fiction before 1800 580.
- Besterman, T., The Beginning of Systematic Bibliography 151.
- Bhattacharje, M., Platonic Ideas in Spenser 55.
- Bitter, A., William Whitehead—Poeta Laureatus 533.
- Blankenagel, J. C., *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* and Freedom of Initiative 339.
- Boas, G., see Lovejoy, A. O.
- Boll, T. E. M., The Works of Edwin Pugh 70.
- Bond, D. F., Two Chap-Book Versions of *The Seven Sages of Rome* 494.

- Bonner, W. H., *De Quincey at Work* 308
- Borgman, A. S., *The Life and Death of William Mountfort* 77
- Bottighioni, G., *Atlante linguistico-etnografico italiano della Corsica* . . . *Introduzione* 270; *Les Raisons et les principaux caractères de l' "Atlante linguistico-etnografico italiano della Corsica"* 270
- Boweis, F. T., *The Date of *Revenge for Honour** 192, *Gascoigne and the Oxford Cipher* 183
- Boys, R. C., *An 18th-Century Essay on Spelling* 209; *An Unusual Meaning of "Make" in Chaucer* 351.
- Bradbrook, M. C., *The School of Night* 616.
- Braddy, H., *Chaucer's Book of the Duchess and Two of Granson's Complaintes* 487, *Sir Lewis Clifford's French Mission of 1391* 33
- Brinkley, R. F. (ed.), *English Poetry of the 17th Century* 468
- Broughton, L. N., see *Sergeantson, M. S.*
- Brown, B. D., *A 13th-Century Chaucerian Analogue* 28.
- Brown, C. (ed.), *Chaucer, The Pardoner's Tale* 379.
- Brown, D. F., *Two Naturalistic Versions of Genesis. Zola and Pardo Bazán* 243
- Brown, E. K., *Studies in the Text of Matthew Arnold's Prose Works* 536.
- Bruehl, A., *Romans français du moyen âge, Essais* 282.
- Bühler, C. F., *A M. E. Prayer Roll* 555; *A New Lydgate-Chaucer MS 1, A Satirical Proclamation* 172.
- Bush, D., *Julius Caesar and Elyot's Governour* 407.
- Cambiaire, C. P. (ed.), *East Tennessee and Western Virginia Mountain Ballads* 150.
- Camp, T. W., *Another Version of "The Things that Cause a Quiet Life"* 186.
- Castelli, A., *La Gerusalemme liberata nella Inghilterra di Spenser* 459.
- Chang, Y. Z., *Sangle, the Merchant-Traveller* 189.
- Chester, A. G., *Notes on the Bibliography of Thomas Churchyard* 180.
- Ciorănescu, A., *Les Imitations de l'Arioste de P. Desportes* 460
- Coffman, G. R., *Old Age in Chaucer's Day* 25.
- Cons, L., *Etat présent des études sur Villon* 283.
- Cooper, L., *Evolution and Repentance* 76.
- Cornet, E., see *Vedel, V.*
- Cornog, W. H. (tr.), *The Anticladian of Alain de Lille* 233.
- Cox, E. G., *A Reference Guide to the Literature of Travel* 310.
- Craig, H., *The Enchanted Glass* 442, *Essays in Dramatic Literature The Parrott Presentation Volume* (ed.) 61.
- David, R., *The Janus of Poets* 526
- Davis, H. (ed.), *The Drapier's Letters to the People of Ireland* 298
- Deane, C. V., *Aspects of 18th-Century Nature Poetry* 302
- Deily, R. H., see *Ehrsam, T. G.*
- Dempster, G., *Chaucer at Work on the Complaint in the *Franklin's Tale** 16.
- Dérioux, H., *La Poésie française contemporaine, 1885-1935* 537.
- De Selincourt, E. (ed.), *Dorothy Wordsworth, George and Sarah Green, A Narrative* 620.
- Diekhoff, J. S., *"The milder shades of purgatory"* 409
- Dillon, G., and Millay, E. St. V. (trs.), *Baudelaire, Flowers of Evil* 453
- Donner, H. W. (ed.), *The Browning Box* 149; *The Works of Thomas Lovell Beddoes* (ed.) 306
- Dowlin, C. M., *Sir William Davenant's Gondibert* 231.
- Droz, E., *Le Manuscrit des *Plaintes d'Acante* de Tristan l'Hermite* 607.
- Durling, D. L., *Georgic Tradition in English Poetry* 302
- Eastwood, D. M., *The Revival of Pascal* 137.
- Eaton, H. A., *Thomas De Quincey* 452.
- Ebeling, H. L., *The Word *Anachronism** 120.
- Edge, M. A., see *Williams, S. T.*
- Ehrsam, T. G., and Deily, R. H., *Bibliographies of twelve Victorian Authors. Directed by R. M. Smith* 458.

- Endson, J. O., A Marston Note 198;
Senecan Elements in Marston's
Antony and Cleopatra 196.
- Einarsson, S., Saga Eiríks Magnússonar 134.
- Elkin, F., Walter Savage Landor's
Studies of Italian Life and Literature 72
- Ericson, E. E., "Reaving the Dead"
in the Age of Chivalry 353
- Evans, G. B., Note on Fletcher and
Massinger's *Little French Lawyer*
406.
- Fagin, N. B., America Through the
Short Story 457.
- Farnham, W., The Medieval Heritage
of Elizabethan Tragedy 435
- Fess, G. M., A New Source for Balzac's
Contes drolatiques 419.
- Forman, M. B. (ed.), The Letters of
John Keats 153
- Fowler, E. B., Spenser and the System
of Courtly Love 55
- Françon, M., *Albums poétiques de*
Marguerite d'Autriche 279; *La*
Pratique et la théorie du rondeau
et du rondel chez Théodore de
Banville 235.
- Frost, R. (ed.), E. A. Robinson,
King Jasper a poem 218.
- Fucilla, J. G., and Tortoreto, A.,
Bibliografia analitica tassiana
(1896-1930) 540.
- Galinsky, H. K., Is Thomas De
Quincey the Author of *The Love-
Charm*? 389.
- Ghosh, J. C., and Withycombe, E.
G., Annals of English Literature,
1475-1925 153.
- Gilbert, A. H., Chapman's Fortune
with Winged Hands 190.
- Gotze, A. (ed.), Trubners Deutsches
Wörterbuch 461, —, Horn, W.,
and Maurer, F. (eds.), Germanische
Philologie. Ergebnisse
und Aufgaben. Festschrift für
Otto Behaghel 604.
- Gottfried, R., The Date of Spenser's
View 176.
- Grabo, C., The Meaning of *The*
Witch of Atlas 144
- Greene, R. L. (ed.), The Early English
Carols 125
- Greg, W. W. (ed.), The Play of
Antichrist from the Chester Cycle
156.
- Gudde, E. G., Social Conflicts in
Medieval German Poetry 524.
- Guichard, L., L'Interprétation graphique,
cinématographique et musicale
des œuvres de Jules Renard
288; L'Œuvre et l'âme de Jules
Renard 288.
- Hagedorn, M., Reformation und
spanische Andachtsliteratur 526.
- Ham, E. B., The Library of the
Association Canado-Américaine
542; Passages from the AN. Book
of Kings 260.
- Hamm, V. M., Addison and the
Pleasures of the Imagination 498.
- Hathaway, L. V., German Literature
of the Mid-Nineteenth Century
in England and America as
Reflected in the Journals 1840-
1914 355
- Hearsey, M. (ed.), *The Complaint*
of Henry Duke of Buckingham
466.
- Hench, A. L., On the Subtly Creeping
Wine of Chaucer's Pardoner
27
- Henning, G. N., Vigny's "Elévations"
269.
- Herben, S. J., Jr., A Note on the
Helm in *Beowulf* 34
- Hermannsson, H., The Problem of
Wineland 463.
- Heseltine, J. E., see Smith, W. G.
- Hinton, E. M., Ireland Through Tudor
Eyes 467.
- Hitchcock, E. V. (ed.), Roper, *The*
Life of Sir Thomas Moore,
knight 155.
- Hocking, E., Ferdinand Brunetière
290.
- Hodgkin, R. H., A History of the
Anglo-Saxons 510.
- Hoepffner, E., *Les Laus de Marie de*
France 225.
- Holmes, U. T., Provençal *huelh de*
veure and *son agre* 264.
- Holsapple, C., Some Early Verses
by Chesterfield 411.
- Horn, W., see Götze, A.
- Hornbeak, K. G., The Complete Letter-
Writer in English, 1568-1800
593.
- Hudson, H. H. (ed.), Hoskins, *Directions*
for Speech and Style 444.
- Hughes, A. H., A Fragment of a
Drama by Herman Grimm 313.

- Iacuzzi, A., The Naive Theme in *The Tempest* as a Link between Thomas Shadwell and Ramón de la Cruz 252.
- Innes, E. R., see Oakden, J. P.
- Isaacs, J., Production and Stage-Management at the Blackfriars Theatre 526.
- Jaberg, K., Aspects géographiques du langage 227.
- Jackson, K., Studies in Early Celtic Nature Poetry 307.
- Jantz, H. S., The Factor of Generation in German Literary History 324.
- Jespersen, O., see Berendsohn, W. A.
- Johnson, W. G., James Thomson's Influence on Swedish Literature in the 18th Century 618.
- Joliat, E., Smollett et la France 66.
- Jones, C., *Ballast-Hill, Bridegroom, Common Bail, and Steel* 509; Chaucer's *Taillynge ynough* 570; The Monk's Tale, A Mediaeval Sermon 570.
- Jones, G. (tr.), Four Icelandic Sagas 152.
- Jones, R. F., Ancients and Moderns 447.
- Judge, C. B., Specimens of 16th Century English Handwriting 74.
- Judson, A. C., A Biographical Sketch of John Young 55.
- Kahn, L. W., Shakespeares Sonette in Deutschland 526.
- Kelchner, G. D., Dreams in O. N. Literature and Their Affinities in Folklore 133.
- Kennedy, C. W. (tr.), O. E. Elegies 465.
- Kennedy, V. W., Samuel Taylor Coleridge. A Selected Bibliography . . . Assisted by M. N. Barton 75.
- Kern, J. B., The Fate of James Thomson's *Edward and Eleanora* 500.
- Korner, J. (ed.), Krisenjahre der Frühromantik 369.
- Koller, K., A Chaucer Allusion 568; A Source for Portions of *The Witch of Atlas* 157.
- Korn, M. A., Die Weltanschauung Jonathan Swifts 298.
- Krakeur, L. G., A Forgotten Participant in the Attack on the Convent: M^{me} de Genlis 89.
- Kreider, P. V., Elizabethan Comic Conventions as Revealed in the Comedies of George Chapman 437.
- Kroner, A., Die Technik des realistischen Dramas bei Ibsen und Galsworthy 78.
- Kuehn, G. W., Thomas Deloney 103.
- Kuethé, J. L., *Poccosin* 210.
- Lancaster, H. C., A History of French Dramatic Literature in the 17th Century 275, Obituary: Gustav Gruenbaum 312.
- Landré, L., Leigh Hunt (1784-1859) 534.
- Langdale, A. B., Phineas Fletcher 617.
- Law, M. H., The English Familiar Essay in the Early 19th Century 70.
- Legouis, P., Dryden and Eton 111.
- Lewis, C. S., The Allegory of Love 515.
- Lockert, L. (tr.), The Best Plays of Racine 461.
- Long, O. W., Literary Pioneers 154.
- Loomis, R. S., Gawain in the *Squire's Tale* 413.
- Loss, H., *Esprece* in *Le Jeu de la Feuillée* 262; A Prototype of the Story in *Zadig* (Ch. III) 576.
- Lovejoy, A. O., The Great Chain of Being 518, — and Boas, G., Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity 421.
- Lyon, E. D., Roger de Ware, Cook 491.
- McBryde, J. M., A Curious Blunder in Some Modern English Translations of King Alfred's Version of Bede's History 412.
- Malone, K. (ed.), *Deor* 129; *Widsith* (ed.) 296.
- Marburg, C., Mr. Pepys and Mr. Evelyn 220.
- Mason, J. E., Gentlefolk in the Making 593.
- Maun, B. K., see Parrish, M. L.
- Maurer, F., see Gotze, A.
- Meylan, E. F., La Date de l'*Oraison de l'âme fidèle* et son importance pour la biographie morale de Marguerite de Navarre 562.
- Millay, E. St. Vincent, see Dillon, G.
- Miller, F. S., Notes on Some 18th-Century Dramas 203.

- Mills, L. J., A Note on *I Tamburlane*, I, ii, 242-43 101.
- Minde-Pouet, G., Schmidt, G., and Steig, R. (eds.), Kleists Werke 362.
- Minder, R., Un Poète romantique allemand Ludwig Tieck (1773-1853) 367, Die religiöse Entwicklung von Karl Philipp Moritz auf Grund seiner autobiographischen Schriften 138.
- Monk, S. H., The Sublime 302, Wordsworth's "unimaginable touch of Time" 503
- Moore, O. H., Bandello and "Clizia" 38.
- More, R. P., and Palmer, P. M., Sources of the Faust Tradition from Simon Magus to Lessing 521.
- Morgan, W. T., A Bibliography of British History (1700-1715) 76, 619
- Morsbach, L., Shakespeares Caesarbild 526.
- Mulder, H., Cognition and Volition in Language 467.
- Myrick, K. O., Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman 445.
- Nahm, M. C. (ed.), Wilson, *The Cheats* 77
- Nicholson, G. G., Un Nouveau principe d'étymologie romane 605.
- Nicolson, M., The Microscope and English Imagination 229
- Nolte, F. O., The Early Middle Class Drama (1696-1774) 140.
- Norman, F. (ed.), *Waldere* 129.
- Norman, H. L., A Possible Source for E. A. Butti's *Castello del Sogno* 256.
- Noyes, R. G., Ben Jonson on the English Stage 1660-1776 437; A MS. Restoration Prologue for *Volpone* 198.
- Oakden, J. P., and Innes, E. R., Alliterative Poetry in M E 430
- Ohmann, E. (ed.), Simon Roths Fremdwörterbuch 372; see also 506.
- Olivero, F., Francis Thompson 455.
- Olshausen, W. v., see Petersen, J.
- Orwen, W. R., Spenser and Gosson 574.
- Painter, S., The Historical Setting of *Robert veez de Perron* 83.
- Palmer, P. M., and More, R. P., Sources of the Faust Tradition from Simon Magus to Lessing 521.
- Parrish, M. L., and Maun, B. K., Charles Kingsley and Thomas Hughes 454
- Parrott, T. M., see Craig, H.
- Patterson, W. F., Three Centuries of French Poetic Theory 122.
- Petersen, J., und W. v. Olshausen (eds.), Lessings Werke 211.
- Peyre, H., Shelley et la France 146.
- Pfeiler, W. K., Coleridge and Schelling's Treatise on the Samothracian Deities 162.
- Pike, R. E., Note on a Letter by Fontenelle 266.
- Pinto, V. de S., Peter Sterry 423
- Pitou, S., Jr., French and English Echoes of a Descriptive Passage in Tasso 265.
- Plimpton, G. A., The Education of Chaucer 464
- Pongs, H., Schillers Urbilder 365
- Pound, Ezra, see Subjects.
- Prinz, R., Die Schöpfung der *Gisla saga Súrssonar* 68.
- Purdy, R. L. (ed.), Sheridan, *The Rivals* 77
- Raven, A. A., A *Hamlet* Bibliography and Reference Guide 1877-1935 437.
- Raynaud, E., En marge de la mée symboliste 537.
- Reade, A. L., Johnsonian Gleanings 449
- Reimers, H., Jonathan Swift 298.
- Renwick, W. L. (ed.), Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland* 55
- Reynolds, E., Early Victorian Drama (1830-1870) 615
- Rivaille, L., Les Débuts de P. Corneille 53.
- Roberts, B. D., Mr. Bulkeley and the Pirate 542.
- Robles, J. (ed.), Lope de Vega, *Cancionero Teatral* 291.
- Roche, A. V., Le Mot "traditionalisme" 167.
- Ross, A. S. C., An Example of Vowel-Harmony in a Young Child 508.
- Ross, W. O., A B Version of the Legend Told by Chaucer's Prioress 23.

- Sale, H. S., *The Date of Skelton's Bowge of Court* 572.
- Sargeaunt, J., John Ford 613
- Savage, H. L., *Brow or Brawn?* 36
- Schinz, A., *D'où sort l'ipres-midi d'un faune de Mallarmé?* 485
- Schmidt, G., see Minde-Pouet, G
- Schucking, L. L., *Der Sinn des Hamlet* 526
- Schulze, I. L., *An Inconsistency in the Thought of Goldsmith* 206
- Seaton, E., *Literary Relations of England and Scandinavia in the 17th Century* 596
- Selincourt, E. de, see De Selmcourt, E.
- Sensabaugh, G. F., *An Answer to Suckling's "Why so pale and wan, fond lover?"* 410.
- Serjeantson, M. S., and Broughton, L. N. (eds.), *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature* 153
- Shafer, R. (ed.), Gissing, *Workers in the Dawn* 76, Paul Elmer More and American Criticism 71
- Sharpe, R. B., *The Real War of the Theatres* 59
- Shellabarger, S., *Lord Chesterfield* 451.
- Sibbald, R. S., *Marionettes in the North of France* 311.
- Siebert, J., *Der Dichter Tannhauser* 620
- Simmons, E. J., Pushkin 425
- Simpson, P., *The Theme of Revenge in Elizabethan Tragedy* 526.
- Singleton, C. S. (ed.), *Canti carnascialeschi del Rinascimento* 459
- Sisson, C. J., *Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age* 437.
- Skeat, W. (tr.), *Milton's Lament for Damon and His Other Latin Poems*. Preface and Introductions by E. H. Visiak 388.
- Smith, A. H. (ed.), *Three Northumbrian Poems* 129, *The Parker Chronicle (832-900)* (ed.) 381.
- Smith, C. G., *Spenser's Theory of Friendship* 598.
- Smith, D. F., *Plays about the Theatre in England* 611.
- Smith, D. N. (ed.), *The Letters of Jonathan Swift to Charles Ford* 298.
- Smith, R. M., see Ehrsam, T. G.
- Smith, W. G., and Heseltine, J. E., *The Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs* 433.
- Sommerfeld, M., *Goethe in Umwelt und Folgezeit* 364.
- Spencer, T., *Death and Elizabethan Tragedy* 437
- Spens, J., *Spenser's Faerie Queene* 55
- Spiecker, F., *Luise Hensel als Dichterin* 371
- Spitzer, L., *Die Sonne geht zu Gnaden* 506, *Note on H. D. Austin's "Letargo"* 473; *Un Passage de Lope de Vega, l'espagnol segullo et l'étymologie du français talus* 79
- Sprague, A. C., *Shakespeare and The Audience* 530
- Spurgeon, C. F. E., *Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us* 526.
- Steig, R., see Minde-Pouet, G
- Steiner, A., *St. Jerome and the First Terzina of the Divine Comedy* 259
- Stoll, E. E., *Hamlet the Man* 526
- Strathmann, E. A., *Lycidas* and the Translation of "May" 398
- Stroup, T. B., *Scenery for the Indian Queen* 408
- Sturtevant, A. M., *Gothic Notes* 207.
- Super, R. H., *Forster as Landor's Literary Executor* 504
- Tenney, E. A., *Thomas Lodge* 63.
- Thalman, M., *Jean Pauls Schulmeister* 341
- Thielke, K. L. F., *Literatur- und Kunstkritik in ihren Wechselbeziehungen* 231.
- Thieme, H., *Zur Verfasserfrage des dekkerschen Stuckes The Pleasant Comedy of Old Fortunatus* 526
- Thompson, J. W., *A Note on The Tempest* 200, *On the Date of the Lancelot* 172.
- Thorpe, C. De W. (ed.), *Keats* 76
- Tilley, A., *Madame de Sévigné* 607.
- Tilley, M. P., "Twill be thine another day" 394
- Tindall, W. Y., *John Bunyan Mechanick Preacher* 64.
- Tisserand, R., *Au Temps de l'Encyclopédie, l'Académie de Dijon de 1740 à 1793* 286, *Les Concurrents de J-J Rousseau à l'Académie de Dijon pour le Prix de 1754* 286.
- Tortoreto, A., and Fucilla, J. G., *Bibliografia analitica tassiana (1896-1930)* 540.

- Tracy, C R, *Porphyria's Lover* 579
 Tuve, R, *Seasons and Months* 462,
Spring in Chaucer and Before
Him 9.
- Vail, C. C. D., *Lessing's Relation to the English Language and Literature* 360
- Van Malssen, P. J W, *Louis XIV d'après les pamphlets répandus en Hollande* 607.
- Vedel, V., *Deux Classiques français vus par un critique étranger: Corneille et son Temps—Molière* Tr. Mme E. Cornet 53
- Vignerat, L.-A., *Notes sur Guillaume de Dole* 87.
- Visiak, E H., see Skeat, W
- Volkmann, E (ed.), *Deutsche Dichtung im Weltkrieg 1914-1918* 357.
- Von der Muhll, E., *Une Source du Zadig de Voltaire* 268.
- Walberg, E. (ed.), *Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence, La Vie de Saint Thomas Becket* 284
- Walker, A, see Willcock, G. D
- Wallerstein, R. C., *Richard Crashaw* 387.
- Wasserman, E. R., *Pre-Restoration Poetry in Dryden's Miscellany* 545.
- Watkins, W. B C, *Johnson and English Poetry before 1660* 449.
- Watson, H F, *Historic Detail in The Borderers* 577.
- Weatherly, E H (ed.), *Speculum Sacerdotale* 601.
- Weber, C A, *Bristols Bedeutung für die englische Romantik und die deutsch-englischen Beziehungen* 466.
- Whelan, M K, *Enthusiasm in English Poetry of the 18th Century (1700-1774)* 302.
- White, H O. (ed.), *The Works of Thomas Purney* 533
- Whitford, H C., *An Uncollected 16th-Century Allusion to The House of Fame* 31.
- Whiting, B. J, *The Miller's Head* 417.
- Wilcox, S C., *The Source of Wordsworth's "The Force of Prayer"* 165.
- Willcock, G D, and Walker, A. (eds.), *Puttenham, The Arte of English Poesie* 444.
- Williams, F. B., Jr., *Notes on Englands Parnassus* 402
- Williams, S T., *The Life of Washington Irving* 223, — and Edge, M A, *A Bibliography of the Writings of Washington Irving* 388
- Wilson, A. H., *A History of the Philadelphia Theatre 1835 to 1855* 75
- Wilson, J D., *The MS of Shakespeare's Hamlet and the Problems of its Transmission* 382, *Shakespeare, Hamlet* (ed.) 382; *What Happens in Hamlet* 382
- Withycombe, E. G., see Ghosh, J. C.
- Witkowski, G. (ed.), *Goethes Faust* 521
- Wolff, H M., *Der Bruch in Kleists Penthesilea* 330
- Woodworth, M. K., *The Literary Career of Sir Samuel Egerton Brydges* 147.
- Wright, L. H., *A Bibliography of the American Novel through 1850* 234
- Wurtsbaugh, J., *Two Centuries of Spenserian Scholarship* 598.
- Yamagiwa, J. K., *A Shakespeare Allusion* 201.
- Yates, F A., *A Study of Love's Labour's Lost* 437.
- Yeats, W B. (ed.), *The Oxford Book of Modern Verse, 1892-1935* 618.
- Young, K., *Chaucer and Aulus Gellus* 347.
- Zeydel, E. H., L Tieck, *The German Romanticist* 295

REVIEWERS

- Abercrombie, L.: R. Frost (ed.), E. A Robinson, *King Jasper: a poem* 218.
- Allen, D. C. M. Hearsey (ed.), *The Complaint of Henry Duke of Buckingham* 466; H. H. Hudson (ed.), Hoskins, *Directions for Speech and Style* 444; G. D. Willcock and A Walker (eds.), *Puttenham, The Arte of English Poesie* 444.
- Anibal, C. E.: J. Robles Pazos (ed.),

- Lope de Vega, Cancionero Teatral 291
- Ayres, H M K Malone (ed), *Widsith* 296
- Baldwin, T W. A. C. Sprague, Shakespeare and The Audience 530
- Ballman, A. B. J W Beach, The Concept of Nature in 19th Century English Poetry 609; C. Grabo, The Meaning of *The Witch of Atlas* 144.
- Beall, C B. A Castelli, *La Gerusalemme liberata* nella Inghilterra di Spenser 459; C. S. Singleton (ed), *Canti carnoscaleschi del Rinascimento* 459, A. Tortoreto and J. G. Fucilla, *Bibliografia analitica tassiana* (1896-1930) 540.
- Blanchard, R.: L M Beattie, John Arbuthnot 222.
- Blankenagel, J. C. G. Minde-Pouet (ed), *Kleists Werke* 362.
- Boas, G. Harvard Tercentenary Publications. I. Factors Determining Human Behavior 428, H. Mulder, Cognition and Volition in Language 467.
- Bondy, L J.: E. Hocking, Ferdinand Brunetiere 290
- Bredvold, L. I. W. T. Morgan, A Bibliography of British History (1700-1715) 76, 619
- Brown, C. R. L. Greene (ed.), *The Early English Carols* 125.
- Brown, F K. M. K. Woodworth, *The Literary Career of Sir Samuel Egerton Brydges* 147.
- Bryan, W. F.: W. A. Berendsohn, *Zur Vorgeschichte des Beowulf* 374.
- Burgum, E B F Olivero, Francis Thompson 455.
- Bush, D.: H. Craig, *The Enchanted Glass* 442.
- Cameron, A.: A. Ciorănescu, *Les Imitations de l'Arioste de P. Desportes* 460.
- Campbell, O. J.: E. Seaton, *Literary Relations of England and Scandinavia in the 17th Century* 596, R. B. Sharpe, *The Real War of the Theatres* 59.
- Case, A. E.: R. A. Aubin, *Topographical Poetry in 18th Century England* 232.
- Cons, L. M. Baudin, *Les Bâtards au théâtre en France de la Renaissance à la fin du 18^e siècle* 52; A. Bruel, *Romans français du moyen âge*, *Essais* 282; M. Françon, *Albums poétiques de Marguerite d'Autriche* 279; H. C. Lancaster, *A History of French Dramatic Literature in the 17th Century* 275; W F Patterson, *Three Centuries of French Poetic Theory* 122.
- Dargan, E. P.: G. Dillon and E St V. Millay (trs), Baudelaire, *Flowers of Evil* 453.
- Davis, A. K., Jr. C. P. Cambiaire (ed), *East Tennessee and Western Virginia Mountain Ballads* 150.
- Demos, R.: A. O. Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being* 518.
- De Vane, W C. T E M Boll, *The Works of Edwin Pugh* 70, M H. Law, *The English Familiar Essay in the Early 19th Century* 70
- Drennon, H.: W G. Johnson, *James Thomson's Influence on Swedish Literature in the 18th Century* 618.
- Du Bois, A. E.: A C. Bartlett, *The Larger Rhetorical Patterns in AS. Poetry* 132; E. Pound, *Make it New: Essays* 155; E. Reynolds, *Early Victorian Drama* (1830-1870) 615.
- Eaton, H. A.: W H. Bonner, *De Quincey at Work* 308
- Edgar, P.: E A Baker, *The History of the English Novel* 309
- Ehrensperger, E. C. G. D. Kelchner, *Dreams in O. N. Literature and Their Affinities in Folklore* 133.
- Einarsson, S.: H. Hermannsson, *The Problem of Wineland* 463; G. Jones (tr.), *Four Icelandic Sagas* 152; R. Prinz, *Die Schöpfung der Gísla saga Súrssonar* 68.
- Ewing, S B.: J. Sargeant, John Ford 613.
- Fagin, N. B.: A. H. Wilson, *A History of the Philadelphia Theatre 1835 to 1855* 75.
- Feise, E.: *Goethe-Kalender auf das Jahr 1937* 521; *Jahrbuch des Freien Deutschen Hochstifts* 521;

- A Kroner, Die Technik des realistischen Dramas bei Ibsen und Galsworthy 78; P M. Palmer and R P More, Sources of the Faust Tradition from Simon Magus to Lessing 521; M Sommerfeld, Goethe in Umwelt und Folgezeit 364; G Witkowski (ed.), Goethes *Faust* 521.
- Frank, G.: P A. Becker, Die Narrenspiele des neuentdeckten Mischbands von Treppereldrucken 311; L Cons, Etat présent des études sur Villon 283; E Hoepffner, Les *Lais* de Marie de France 225.
- Frantz, R. V.: R. F. Jones, Ancients and Moderns 447
- Friedrich, W. G. M. C. Bradbrook, The School of Night 616; R. F. Brinkley (ed.), English Poetry of the 17th Century 468; K O. Myrick, Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman 445.
- Gaede, W. R.: H. Adolf (ed.), Im Neuen Reich 1871-1914 357; R. F. Arnold (ed.), Fremdherrschaft und Befreiung 1795-1815 357; E. Volkman (ed.), Deutsche Dichtung im Weltkrieg 1914-1918 357.
- Gulick, S L., Jr.: S Shellabarger, Lord Chesterfield 451
- Harap, J. C.: C Marburg, Mr. Pepys and Mr. Evelyn 220.
- Havens, G. R. A O. Lovejoy and G. Boas, Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity 421.
- Havens, R. D.: R W. Armour (ed.), The Literary Recollections of Barry Cornwall 154; L Cooper, Evolution and Repentance 76; E de Selincourt (ed.), Dorothy Wordsworth, *George and Sarah Green, A Narrative* 620; M. B. Forman (ed.), The Letters of John Keats 153; J. C. Ghosh and E G Withycombe, Annals of English Literature, 1475-1925 153; M. S. Serjeantson and L. N. Broughton (eds.), Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature 153; R Shafer (ed.), Gissing, *Workers in the Dawn* 76; C. De W. Thorpe (ed.), Keats 76.
- Heffner, R.: M. Bhattacharjee, Platonic Ideas in Spenser 55; E. B. Fowler, Spenser and the System of Courtly Love 55; A. C. Judson, A Biographical Sketch of John Young 55; W. L. Renwick (ed.), Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland* 55; J. Spens, Spenser's *Faerie Queene* 55.
- Hermannsson, H.: S. Einarsson, Saga Eiriks Magnússonar 134
- Hillyer, R. W. B. Yeats (ed.), The Oxford Book of Modern Verse, 1892-1935 618.
- Holloway, O E. C A Weber, Bristols Bedeutung für die englische Romantik und die deutsch-englischen Beziehungen 466.
- Hoops, R.: A. H. Smith and F. Norman (eds.), Methuens O. E. Library 129.
- Howard, W. G.: J. Petersen und W. v. Olshausen (eds.), Lessings Werke 211; C C D Vail, Lessings Relation to the English Language and Literature 360
- Hughes, M. Y.: C. G. Smith, Spenser's Theory of Friendship 598; J Wurtsbaugh, Two Centuries of Spenserian Scholarship 598.
- Jaeger, H.: H. Pongs, Schillers Urbilder 365.
- Johnson, F. R.: M Nicolson, The Microscope and English Imagination 229.
- Jones, C. B. D. Roberts, Mr Bulkeley and the Pirate 542.
- Jones, H. M.: R. W. Armour, Barry Cornwall A Biography of Bryan Waller Proctor 73; R. Shafer, Paul Elmer More and American Criticism 71
- Jones, P. F. H. Henel, Studien zum altenglischen Computus 136.
- Jones, R. F.: A. Bitter, William Whitehead—Poeta Laureatus 533; H. O. White (ed.), The Works of Thomas Purney 533.
- Kirby, T. A.: C. S. Lewis, The Allegory of Love 515.
- Kirk, R.: A. B. Langdale, Phineas Fletcher 617; D F. Smith, Plays about the Theatre in England 611.
- Kurrelmeyer, W.: F. Behrend, Deutsche Studien 462; A. Gotze (ed.), Trubners Deutsches Wörterbuch 461; E Ohmann (ed.), Simon Roths Fremdwörterbuch 372; see also 506.

- Kurtz, B. P. H. Peyre, Shelley et la France 146.
- Lancaster, H. C. N Abercrombie, The Origins of Jansenism 137, L. Batiffol, Richelieu et Corneille 607, E. Droz, Le Manuscrit des *Plaintes d'Acante* de Tristan l'Hermite 607, D. M. Eastwood, The Revival of Pascal 137; L. Lockert (tr.), The Best Plays of Racine 461; L. Rivaille, Les Débuts de P. Corneille 53; R. S. Sibbald, Marionettes in the North of France 311; A. Tilley, Madame de Sévigné 607, P. J. W. Van Malssen, Louis XIV d'après les pamphlets répandus en Hollande 607, V. Vedel, Deux Classiques français vus par un critique étranger: Corneille et son Temps —Molière 53
- Law, R. A. A. Baesecke, Das Schauspiel der englischen Komödianten in Deutschland 526, R. David, The Janus of Poets 526; M. Hagedorn, Reformation und spanische Andachtsliteratur 526, J. Isaacs, Production and Stage-Management at the Blackfriars Theatre 526, L. W. Kahn, Shakespeares Sonette in Deutschland 526, L. Morsbach, Shakespeares Caesarbild 526, L. L. Schucking, Der Sinn des *Hamlet* 526, *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* Bd. 71 526; P. Simpson, The Theme of Revenge in Elizabethan Tragedy 526, C. F. E. Spurgeon, Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us 526; E. E. Stoll, Hamlet the Man 526, H. Thieme, Zur Verfasserfrage des dekkerschen Stuckes *The Pleasant Comedy of Old Fortunatus* 526
- Lawrence, W. W.: W. Farnham, The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy 435
- Levy, R. E. Walberg (ed.), *Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence, La Vie de Saint Thomas Becket* 284
- Lovejoy, A. O.: V. de S. Pinto, Peter Sterry 423.
- Lowry, H. F.: E. K. Brown, Studies in the Text of Matthew Arnold's Prose Works 536.
- McDowell, T.: S. T. Williams, The Life of Washington Irving 223.
- McKillop, A. D.: R. J. Allen, The Clubs of Augustan London 602, C. M. Dowlin, Sir William Davenant's *Gondibert* 231, K. L. F. Thielke, Literatur- und Kunstkritik in ihren Wechselbeziehungen 231
- McManaway, J. G. E. M. Hinton, Ireland Through Tudor Eyes 467
- Magoun, F. P., Jr.: R. H. Hodgkin, A History of the Anglo-Saxons 510.
- Malone, K. C. S. Baldwin, Three Medieval Centuries of Literature in England, 1100-1400 378; C. W. Kennedy (tr.), O. E. Elegies 465
- Manning, C. A. E. J. Simmons, Pushkin 425
- Morgan, B. Q.: L. V. Hathaway, German Literature of the Mid-Nineteenth Century in England and America as Reflected in the Journals 1840-1914 355.
- Morley, E. J. H. A. Eaton, Thomas De Quincey 452.
- Noyes, E. S.: E. Joliat, Smollett et la France 66.
- Paradise, N. B.: E. A. Tenney, Thomas Lodge 63.
- Parker, W. R.: W. Skeat (tr.), Milton's *Lament for Damon* and His Other Latin Poems 388
- Parks, G. B.: E. G. Cox, A Reference Guide to the Literature of Travel 310.
- Parrott, T. M. J. D. Wilson, The MS. of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and the Problems of its Transmission 382; J. D. Wilson (ed.), Shakespeare, *Hamlet* 382, J. D. Wilson, What Happens in *Hamlet* 382.
- Parry, J. J.: K. Jackson, Studies in Early Celtic Nature Poetry 307.
- Patch, H. R.: W. H. Cornog (tr.), The *Anticlaudian* of Alain de Lille 233; W. W. Greg (ed.), The Play of Antichrist from the Chester Cycle 156; R. Tuve, Seasons and Months 462
- Perkins, D.: O. W. Long, Literary Pioneers 154.
- Perkinson, R. H.: E. V. Hitchcock (ed.), Roper, *The Lyfe of Sir Thomas Moore knyghte* 155.
- Pope, P. R.: E. G. Gudde, Social Conflicts in Medieval German Poetry 524.

- Pottle, F. A.: A L Reade, Johnsonian Gleanings 449; W. B C Watkins, Johnson and English Poetry before 1660 449
- Price, L. M F O Nolte, The Early Middle Class Drama (1696-1774) 140.
- Prior, M E C V Deane, Aspects of 18th-Century Nature Poetry 302; D L Durling, Georgic Tradition in English Poetry 302, S. H Monk, The Sublime 302, M. K Whelan, Enthusiasm in English Poetry in the 18th Century (1700-1774) 302
- Quintana, R. H. Davis (ed.), *The Drapier's Letters to the People of Ireland* 298, M A Korn, Die Weltanschauung Jonathan Swifts 298, H Reimers, Jonathan Swift 298, D N Smith (ed.), *The Letters of Jonathan Swift to Charles Ford* 298.
- Ray, M. T G. Ehrsam and R H Deily, Bibliographies of twelve Victorian Authors 458.
- Ross, W O E H Weatherly (ed.), *Speculum Sacerdotale* 601.
- Ruud, M B. C Brown (ed.), Chaucer, *The Pardoner's Tale* 379; G. A Plimpton, *The Education of Chaucer* 464
- Savage, H. L. J. P. Oakden, *Aliterative Poetry in M. E* 430
- Schaffer, A. L. Guichard, L'Interprétation graphique, cinématographique et musicale des œuvres de Jules Renard 288; L. Guichard, L'Œuvre et l'âme de Jules Renard 288.
- Schinz, A. Cinquantenaire du symbolisme 537; H Dérioux, La Poésie française contemporaine, 1885-1935 537; E Raynaud, En Marge de la mêlée symboliste 537; R Tisserand, Les Concurrents de J.-J. Rousseau à l'Académie de Dijon pour le Prix de 1754 286; R. Tisserand, Au Temps de l'Encyclopédie, l'Académie de Dijon de 1740 à 1793 286
- Small, G. W. A. H. Smith (ed.), *The Parker Chronicle* (832-900) 381.
- Snow, R H.: H. W. Donner (ed.), *The Works of Thomas Lovell Beddoes* 306.
- Snyder, A. D.: V. W. Kennedy, Samuel Taylor Coleridge A Selected Bibliography 75.
- Spencer, H. N B. Allen, The Sources of John Dryden's Comedies 437; A. S. Borgman, The Life and Death of William Mountfort 77; H. Craig (ed.), *Essays in Dramatic Literature: The Parrott Presentation Volume* 61; P V. Kreider, Elizabethan Comic Conventions as Revealed in the Comedies of George Chapman 437; M. C Nahm (ed.), Wilson, *The Cheats* 77; R. G Noyes, Ben Jonson on the English Stage 1660-1776 437; R. L Purdy (ed.), Sheridan, *The Rivals* 77; A. A. Raven, A *Hamlet* Bibliography and Reference Guide 1877-1935 437, C J. Sisson, Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age 437; T. Spencer, Death and Elizabethan Tragedy 437; S. T. Williams and M. A. Edge, A Bibliography of the Writings of Washington Irving 388, F. A. Yates, A Study of *Love's Labour's Lost* 437.
- Spitzer, L.: G. Bottiglioni, Atlante linguistico-etnografico italiano della Corsica . . . Introduzione 270; G. Bottiglioni, Les Raisons et les principaux caractères de l'"Atlante linguistico-etnografico italiano della Corsica" 270; K. Jaberg, Aspects géographiques du langage 227; G. G. Nicholson, Un Nouveau principe d'étymologie romane 605
- Springer, O. A. Gotze, W. Horn, F. Maurer (eds), *Germanische Philologie* 604.
- Stout, G. D. L. Landré, Leigh Hunt (1784-1859) 534.
- Tannenbaum, S. A. C B Judge, Specimens of 16th Century English Handwriting Taken from Contemporary Public and Private Records 74
- Thalmann, M.: E. H. Zeydel, L. Tieck, The German Romanticist 295.
- Thorp, M F.: M. L. Parrish and B. K. Maun, Charles Kingsley and Thomas Hughes 454.

- Turner, A M · H W Donner (ed),
The Browning Box 149
- Ustick, W. L. K G Hornbeak, The
Complete Letter-Writer in Eng-
lish 1568-1800 593, J E Mason,
Gentlefolk in the Making 593.
- Vail, C. C. D. B Aikin-Sneath,
Comedy in Germany in the First
Half of the 18th Century 427
- Vane, W C. de, see De Vane, W. C.
- Warren, A. R C Wallerstein,
Richard Crashaw 387.
- Whiting, B J W G Smith, The
Oxford Dictionary of English
Proverbs 433
- Wilkens, F. H. J. Siebert, Der
Dichter Tannhauser 620
- Williams, B C. N B Fagin, Amer-
ica Through the Short Story 457.
- Williams, S. T : F. Elkin, Walter
Savage Landor's Studies of Ital-
ian Life and Literature 72.
- Wimberly, L C W. Y Tindall,
John Bunyan Mechanick Preacher
64.
- Winship, G P T Besterman, The
Beginning of Systematic Bibliog-
raphy 151.
- Zeydel, E. H. J. Korner (ed), Kri-
senjahre der Fruhromantik 369;
R. Minder, Un Poète romantique
allemand Ludwig Tieck (1773-
1853) 367; R. Minder, Die reh-
grose Entwicklung von Karl
Philipp Moritz auf Grund seiner
autobiographischen Schriften 138;
F. Specker, Luise Hensel als
Dichterin 371.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received]

Crane, William G.—Wit and Rhetoric in the Renaissance. *New York*: Columbia University Press, 1937. Pp. viii + 285 \$3 50

Duden (The English).—Adapted from Duden's "Bildwörterbuch" by H. Klien and M. Ridpath-Klien. *New York*: Stechert, 1937. Pp. xvi + 133. \$2 40.

Gagey, Edmond McAdoo.—Ballad Opera. *New York*: Columbia University Press, 1937. Pp. xii + 259. \$3 00.

Grierson, Sir Herbert J. C.—Milton and Wordsworth, poets and prophets: a study of their reactions to political events. *New York*: Macmillan, 1937. Pp. x + 185. \$2 50

Muller, Herbert J.—Modern Fiction, A Study of Values. *New York*: Funk & Wagnalls, 1937. Pp. xvi + 447. \$2 80

Pascal, R.—Shakespeare in Germany, 1740-1815. *Cambridge, England*: University Press, 1937. Pp. x + 199. \$2 50

Thomas, J. M., Manchester, F. A., and Scott, F. W.—Composition for college students 4th ed. *New York*: Macmillan, 1937. Pp. xviii + 760. \$2.00.

Treble, H. A. and Vallins, G. H.—An A. B. C. of English Usage. Preface by Henry Seidel Canby. *New York*: Oxford University Press, 1937. Pp. 195. \$1.50. (American Edition.)

Walpole's (Horace) Correspondence with the Rev. William Cole.—Edited by W. S. Lewis and A. Dayle Wallace. *New Haven*: Yale University Press, 1937. Vol. I, pp. lxi + 388; Vol. II, pp. viii + 464. \$15.00

GERMAN

Ahlden, Tage Robert.—Die Kölner Bibel-Frühdrucke. Entstehungsgeschichte, Stellung im niederdeutschen Schrifttum. Diss. Lund [Lunder germanistische Forschungen. 5]. *Lund*: Berling, 1937. viii, 251 pp., 3 plates, Kr. 10

Arnim, Bettina von, u. Baier, Rudolf.—Unveröffentlichte Briefe und Tagebuchaufzeichnungen. Hrsg. von Kurt Gassen. [Aus den Schätzen der Univ. Bibl. zu Greifswald 11]. *Greifswald*: Bamberg, 1937. 98 pp. M. 3 60.

Bäte, Ludwig.—Annette am Bodensee. *Borna*: Noske [1937]. 63 pp. 3 plates. M. 1.80.

Baumecker, Gottfried.—Schillers Schönheitslehre. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1937. 137 pp. M. 5.

Beinhch, Alexander.—Kindheit und Kindesseele in der deutschen Dichtung um 1900. Diss. [Sprache u. Kultur d. germ. und roman. Völker. B, Bd. 23]. *Breslau*: Priebratsch, 1937. vi, 130 pp. M. 4 20

Bertram, Otto.—Die Mundart der mittleren Vorderpfalz [Frankische Forschungen. 7]. *Erlangen*: Palm & Enke, 1937. viii, 225 pp. 4 plates. M. 8 50

Bibel und deutsche Kultur. Veröffentlichungen des Deutschen Bibel-Archivs in Hamburg Bd. VII: Alttestamentliche Texte zur Bibelverdeutschung des Mittelalters nebst einem Festartikel zum Jubiläum der niederländischen Staatenbibel und dem Glossar zu Bd. IV-VII Hrsg. in Gemeinschaft mit Cebus Cornelis de Bruin, Fritz Julicher, Willy Ludtke und Erich Zimmermann von Hans Vollmer. *Potsdam*: Akad. Verlagsges. Athenaion, 1937. viii, 222 pp.

Blumrich, Hermann.—Die Flurnamen von Stadt und Gemeinde Friedland. *Friedland*: B [ö. S. R.]: F. Riemer, 1936. 36 pp. K 3.

Breitwieser, Erwin.—Der volkskundliche Ertrag der Schriften von Hermann Löns. Diss. Giessen [Giessener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie. 48]. *Giessen*: von Münchow, 1937. 103 pp. M. 3 75.

Bues, Manfred.—Die Versportung der deutschen Sprache im 20. Jahrhundert. Diss. [Deutsches Werden H. 10]. *Greifswald*: Bamberg, 1937. 103 pp. M. 3.

Calmberg, Ernesta.—Welthild und Auftrag des Dichters, von Nietzsche bis George. [Diss. Tübingen]. *Würzburg*: R. Mayr, 1936. 178 pp. M. 3.

Carsten, Rehder Heinz.—Die "ingen" Namen der südlichen Nordseeküste. Ein Beitrag zur Siedlungsgeschichte der Chauken, Friesen u. Sachsen. Diss. [Aus Hanseischem Raum Bd. 2]. *Hamburg*: Evert, 1937. 135 pp. 3 plates. M. 6.

Cremer, Hanns.—Die Bildergeschichten Wilhelm Buschs. Diss. München. *Düsseldorf*: Nolte, 1937. v, 92 pp. M. 2 80

Detjen, Heinrich.—Hermann Bossdorf als Dramatiker. Ein Beitrag zur Würdigung des Dichters. *Hamburg*: Propper, 1936. 119 pp. M. 3.

Ebeling, Hans.—Ernst Wiechert Der Weg eines Dichters. *Berlin*: Grote, 1937. 253 pp. M. 2 80

Eckert, Gerhard.—Der Zeitungsroman von heute. [Zeitung und Zeit. [N.F.] Reihe A, Bd. 1]. *Frankfurt a. M.*: Diesterweg, 1937. 71 pp. M. 1.30.

Edda.—Die Lieder des Codex regius nebst verwandten Denkmälern. Hrsg. von Gustav Neckel. 2: Kommentierendes Glossar. 2. durchges. Aufl. [Germanische Bibliothek. Abt. 2, Bd. 9, 2]. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1936. xxxii, 222 pp. M. 6.90.

Eichholz, Georg.—Die Geschichte als theologisches Problem bei Lessing. Diss. Auszug [Aus Theol. Studien u. Kritiken] *Gotha*: [1937] 47 pp.

Eulert, Edith.—Angelus Silesius als Streittheologe seiner Zeit. Diss. Münster. *Dresden*: Dittert, 1936 64 pp.

Elema, J.—Stil und poetischer Charakter bei Detlev von Liliencron. Diss. Groningen. *Amsterdam*: H. J. Paris, 1937. vi, 495 pp. Fl. 5 90

Ellenberger, Eduard.—Wortgeschichtlicher Aufschluss aus deutschen Klassikerübersetzungen des 18. Jhs. Diss. [Giessener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie. 51] *Giessen*: von Munchow, 1937 89 pp. M. 3.20.

Emmersleben, August.—Die Antike in der romantischen Theorie. Die Gebrüder Schlegel und die Antike [Germanische Studien. H. 191] *Berlin*: Ebering, 1937. 156 pp. M. 6.

Engel, Karl Heinz.—Goethe in seinem Verhältnis zur französischen Sprache (dargestellt bis 1805). Diss. Göttingen *Quakenbrück*: Kleinert, 1937 vii, 196 pp.

Farrell, Ralph.—Stefan Georges Beziehungen zur englischen Dichtung. [Germanische Studien. H. 192]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1937. 239 pp. M. 10.

Fassnacht, Max.—Die drei Wahrheiten in der Volksdichtung. Eine vergleichende Untersuchung. [Bausteine zur Volkskunde und Religionswissenschaft. H. 16]. *Buhl*: Konkordia, 1937. 74 pp. M. 2 50.

Festschrift für Albert Leitzmann Hrg. von Ernst Vincent und Karl Wesle [Jenaer germanist. Forschungen. Sonderband 2]. *Jena*: Frommann, 1937 124 pp. M. 6 50

Freydorf, Johann von.—Die Sonette an Orpheus von Rainer Maria Rilke als zyklische Dichtung. Diss. *Würzburg*: Triltsch, 1937 30 pp. M. 1.50.

Friedrich, Theodor.—Goethes Faust, erläutert mit einem Faust-Wörterbuch. [Reclams Universal-Bibliothek. Nr. 7177-7180]. *Leipzig*: Reclam [1937]. 309 pp. M. 1.80.

Fuchs, Hella.—Hermann Hesse zu seinem sechzigsten Geburtstag *Prag*: Calve, 1937. 14 pp. Kč 8.

Gaede, Wilhelm R.—Goethe. In collaboration with Wilhelm Hubben and Karl Reuning. The Cordon Co., 1937 63 pp.

Galley, Horst.—Resignation und Entsagung in Adalbert Stifters Dichtung und Leben. Diss. *Göttingen*: 1937. 71 pp.

Guzinski, Elisabeth.—Karl Immermann als Zeitkritiker. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der deutschen Selbstkritik. [Neue deutsche Forschungen. Abt. Neuere deutsche Literaturgeschichte, Bd. 11]. *Berlin*: Junker & Dunnhaupt, 1937. 328 pp. M. 14.

Hamburger Wörterbuch, Das Weihnachtsgabe (1936) für die Mitarbeiter und Freunde des Hamburger Wörterbuches. [*Hamburg*: Wachholtz, 1936]. 24 pp. 4°.

Hamm, Eleonore.—Rheinische Legenden des 12. Jhs. Diss. Köln *Würzburg*: Triltsch, 1937. 82 pp. M. 3.

Harmuth, Adolf.—Orts- und Flurnamen im Bezirke Eisenstadt *Eisenstadt*: Schiffer, 1937. 86 pp. M. 1 50.

Hartsen, M. J.—Die Natur im Leben und in den Werken der Annette Frein von Droste-Hulshoff. *Münster v. W*: Stenderhoff, 1936. 41 pp.

Hemmerich, Karl.—Gerhart Hauptmanns Veland Seine Entstehung und Deutung. Diss. *Würzburg*: Memminger, 1935. 68 pp.

Holderlin, Briefe [Insel-Bucherei Nr. 506] *Leipzig*: Insel-Verlag [1937] 93 pp. M. 0 80.

Hof, Walter.—Der Gedanke der deutschen Sendung in der deutschen Literatur. Diss. *Giessen* [Giessener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie. 50]. *Giessen*: von Munchow, 1937. 145 pp. M. 7.

Hoffmann, Helmut.—Mensch und Volk im Kriegserlebnis, dargestellt an typischen deutschen Dichtungen aus der Zeit des Weltkrieges. Diss. *Hamburg*. [Germanische Studien. H. 189]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1937. 81 pp. M. 3 60.

Hubben, Wilhelm.—Die deutsche Jugendbewegung. In collaboration with Wilhelm R. Gaede and Karl Reuning. The Cordon Co., 1937. 64 pp.

Hubner, Arthur.—Zur Überlieferung des "Ackermanns aus Bohmen." [Sitzungsber. der Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1937, 8]. *Berlin*: de Gruyter, 1937 22 pp. 4°. M. 1 50.

Jaffé, Gerhard.—Geschichte der Runenforschung. Geistesgeschichtliche Betrachtung der Auffassungen im 16-18. Jh. Diss. *Göttingen*. *Berlin*: Behr's Verlag, 1937 127 pp. M. 4 50.

Jungbluth, Günther.—Untersuchungen zu Heinrich von Veldeke. Diss. *Heidelberg*. [Deutsche Forschungen. Bd. 31]. *Frankfurt a. M.*: Diesterweg, 1937 191 pp. M. 8.

Jungkunz, Antoine Claire.—Menschen-darstellung im deutschen höfischen Roman des Barock. Diss. *München* [Germanische Studien. H. 190]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1937 230 pp. M. 8.80.

Jungmair, Otto.—Der oberösterreichische Heimatdichter Gregor Goldbacher. Zur Vollendung s. Sechzigers. [Aus: Der Volksbote. Jg. 46, H. 3]. *Linz*: 1935. 15 pp.

—Der oberösterreichische Heimatdichter Karl Mayer-Freinberg. Zur Vollendung s. Sechzigers. [Vermeehrt aus: Der Volksbote. Jg. 46, H. 2]. *Linz*: 1935. 15 pp.

Jungmair, Otto.—Dr. Hans Zotl Zur Vollendung seines 90 Lebensjahres [Aus Der Volksbote Jg. 47, H. 3]. *Linz*. 1936. 8 pp.

Kampe, Konrad.—Hebbels Balladen Diss *Hamburg*: Evert, 1937. 69 pp. M. 3.80

Kimmich, Anne.—Kritische Auseinandersetzung mit dem Begriff "Neuromantik" in der Literaturgeschichtsschreibung. Diss. *Tubingen*. Becht, 1936. 145 pp.

Krause, Hilde.—Wilhelm von Polenz als Erzähler. Diss. *München*: 1937. 71 typewritten pp

Krause, Wolfgang.—Runeninschriften im älteren Futhark. Hrsg. und erklärt [Schritten der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft Geisteswiss. Kl. Jahr 13, H. 4]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1937. xv, 258 pp. 4°. M. 18.

Krogmann, Willy.—Die Heimatfrage des Heland im Lichte des Wortschatzes. *Wismar*: Hinstorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1937. 242 pp. M. 16.

—Berliner Sprachproben aus sieben Jahrhunderten. Ausgewählt und hrsg. *Berlin*: R. Pfau, 1937. 112 pp. M. 2.80.

Kruger, A. G.—Die Quellen der Schwanneritterdichtungen. *Gifhorn, Hannover*: Adolf Enke, 1936. 297 pp. M. 12.

Kudrun.—Hrsg. von Karl Bartsch. 4. Aufl. (Helioplandruck 1880). [Deutsche Klassiker des Mittelalters Bd. 2]. *Leipzig*: F. A. Brockhaus, 1937. xxviii, 357 pp. M. 3.60.

Kulp, Johannes.—Arndt als christlich-volkischer Dichter [Welt des Gesangbuchs. H. 14]. *Leipzig*: Schloessmann [1937]. 56 pp. M. 1.50.

Kuttner, Margot.—Die Gestaltung des Individualitätsproblems bei E. T. A. Hoffmann. Diss *Hamburg Düsseldorf*: Nolte, 1936. v, 108 pp.

Labhardt, André.—Contributions à la critique et à l'explication des gloses de Reichenau. Diss. Neuchâtel. [Borna: Noske, 1936. ix, 107 pp.

Latzke, Rudolf.—Aus Roseggers Werkezeit. *Wien und Leipzig*: österr. Bundesverlag, 1937. 172 pp. M. 4.

Lohde, Walter.—Schiller und das Christentum. Neue vermehrte Auflage *München*: Ludendorffs Verl. 1937. 25 pp. M. 0.60.

Luther, Arthur.—Deutsches Land in deutscher Erzählung. Ein literarisches Ortslexikon. 2. vollst. umgearb. u. ergänzte Aufl. *Leipzig*: Hiersemann, 1937. xii pp, 862 cols. M. 12.

Mader, Ignaz.—Die Ortsnamen der Gemeinde Pfeifersberg bei Brixen a. E. Mit siedlungsgeschichtlichen Bemerkungen. [Schlern-Schriften. 37]. *Innsbruck*: Wagner, 1937. 104 pp. M. 4.25.

Marzell, Heinrich.—Wörterbuch der deutschen Pflanzennamen. Unter Mitwirkung von Wilhelm Wissmann (20-25 Lieferungen).

Lfg. 1: Abelia-Agrimonia. *Leipzig*: Hirzel, 1937. x, pp., 144 cols. 4°. M. 5.

[Mayer-Freimberg, Karl.—] Im Zeichen Franz Stelzhamers Eine Erinnerungsschrift zu Dr. Hans Zotls vollendetem 90. Lebensjahr *Linz*: 1936. 16 pp

Mayer-Freimberg, Karl.—Gregor Goldbacher. (Eine Rückschau zur Vollendung s. 60. Lebensjahres) [Aus Steyrer Zeitung. 1935, Nr. 119 120]. *Linz*: 1935. 12 pp.

Mettin, Hermann Christian.—Die Bedeutung des Staates in Schillers Leben, Weltanschauung und Dramen. (Ein Beitrag zur Untersuchung des Verhältnisses von Staat und Drama). Diss. *Heidelberg. Berlin*: 1934. 65 pp.

Mövius, Ruth.—Ramer Maria Rulkes Stunden-Buch. Entstehung und Gehalt *Leipzig*: Insel-Verlag, 1937. 261 pp. M. 6

Naumann, Hans, u. Betz, Werner.—Althochdeutsches Elementarbuch. Grammatik und Texte. [Sammlung Göschen. 1111]. *Berlin*: de Gruyter, 1937. 133 pp. M. 1.62.

Neubert, Erich.—Ein Spaziergang durch die Magdeburger Mundart. [Magdeburger Kultur- und Wirtschaftsleben. Nr. 11]. *Magdeburg*: 1937. 66 pp. M. 1.50.

Neuwinger, Rudolf.—Die deutsche Mystik unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des "Cherubinischen Wandersmannes" Johann Schefflers. [Schriften zur deutschen Geistes- und Bildungsgeschichte. Hft. 1]. *Bleicherode*: Nieft, 1937. 220 pp. M. 6 (Also as Leipzig dissertation: Johann Schefflers "Cherubinischer Wandersmann" und die deutsche Mystik).

Niederdeutsches Jahrbuch. Jahrbuch des Vereins für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung. Jg. 62, 1936. *Hamburg*: Wachholtz, 1937. 173 pp. M. 6

Oeding, Fritz.—Bibliographie der Louise von François. Zusammengestellt. [Heimatkundliche Schriften H. 1]. *Weissenfels*: L. Kell, 1937. 47 pp. M. 1.20.

Olesch, Reinhold.—Beiträge zur ober-schlesischen Dialektforschung Die Mundart der Kobylorze. 1. Deskriptive Phonetik Diss *Berlin*. [Veröffentlichungen des Slav Instituts an d. Univ. Berlin. 19]. *Leipzig*: Harrassowitz, 1937. xxvii, 115 pp. M. 10.

—Die slavischen Dialekte Oberschlesiens. [Arbeiten aus d. Inst. f. Lautforschung an d. Univ. Berlin Nr. 3]. *Leipzig*: Harrassowitz, 1937. 84 pp. M. 4.50.

Otto, Günter.—Bauerliche Ethik in der schlesischen Volksage. [Deutschkundliche Arbeiten. B. Bd. 4]. *Breslau*: Maruschke & Berendt, 1937. vii, 78 pp. M. 3.

Peuckert, Will Erich.—Schlesisch Mit Original-Zeichnungen v. Willibald Krain u. a. [Was nicht im Wörterbuch steht. Bd. 7]. *München*: Piper [1937]. 237 pp. M. 3.20.

Popp, Emil.—Die Sprache Ulrichs von dem Turlin. [Forschungen zur Sudetendeutschen Heimatkunde H. 7]. *Reichenberg, Leipzig*: Kraus, 1937 89 pp. M. 4

Rahmelow, Werner.—Zu den Anfängen des feuilletonischen Stiles. (Untersuchungen an Heine) Diss. Freiburg: B. *Hamburg*: Schimkus, 1936 72 typewritten pp.

Reuning, Karl.—Reise und Verkehr in Deutschland In collaboration with Wilhelm R Gaede and Wilhelm Hubben. The Cordon Co., 1937. 64 pp.

Ringelnatz, Joachim. In memoriam—(d. Hans Botticher). Eine Bibliographie, eingefügt in biogr Notizen, unveröffentl. Gedichte und Erinnerungen der Freunde. [*Leipzig* Poeschel & Trepte, 1937]. 138 pp. 4°.

Samhaber, Edward. Edward Samhaber. Zur Erinnerung an die Enthüllung der Gedenktafel an seinem Wohn- und Sterbehaus in Linz *Linz*. [D. F. Berger], 1937. 15 pp.

Schmid, Günther.—Goethe, Thüringer Laboranten und ein Faustsagenfragment. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1937. 67 pp. 3 plates M. 270.

Schroder, Edward.—Aus den Anfängen des deutschen Buchtitels. [Nachrichten von der Ges. der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen Philol.-hist. Kl. Fachgr. 4, N. F. Bd. 2, Nr. 1] *Göttingen*: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1937 48 pp. M. 3.

—Die Überlieferung des "Frankfurters" (der "Theologia Deutsch"). [Nachrichten von d. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen. Philol. hist. Kl. Fachgr. 4, N. F. Bd. 2, Nr. 2]. *Göttingen*: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1937. Pp. 49-65 M. 1.

Schroder, Walter Johannes.—Fritz Stavenhagen Leben und Werk *Neumünster i. H.*: Wachholtz, 1937. 141 pp. 1 plate. M. 3.

Schebnemann, Ernst.—Artushof und Abenteuer. Zeichnung hofischen Daseins in Hartmanns Erec *Habilitationsschrift*. [Deutschkundliche Arbeiten. A, Bd. 8.]. *Breslau*: Maruschke & Berendt, 1937. vii, 120 pp. M. 5 00.

Schwabe, Joachim.—Friedrich Baron de la Motte Fouqué als Herausgeber literarischer Zeitschriften der Romantik Diss [Sprache und Kultur der german. und roman. Völker. B, Bd. 20] *Breslau*: Priebatsch, 1937. vii, 165 pp. M. 4 80.

Seckel, Dietrich.—Holderlins Sprachrhythmus. Mit einer Einleitung über das Problem des Rhythmus und einer Bibliographie zur Rhythmusforschung. [Palaestra 207]. *Leipzig*: Mayer & Müller, 1937. iv, 349 pp. M. 20.

Seibert, Ludwig.—Die Seligenstädter Flurnamen. Gesammelt und erläutert. *Seligenstadt in Hessen*: Sprey jr., 1936. 63 pp. M. 075.

Siegel, Hermann.—"Lieb' und Lust und Leben . . ." Die Welt des Kindes in den Dichtungen Conrad Ferdinand Meyers. *Basel*: Geering, 1936. 80 pp. Fr. 6

Stroh, Fritz.—Zur Deutung hessischer Flurnamen [Aus Hess Blätter für Volkskunde Bd 35]. *Giessen*: von Munchow, 1936. 48 pp. M. 1.

Trunz, Erich.—Dichtung und Volkstum in den Niederlanden im 17. Jh. Ein Vergleich mit Deutschland und ein Überblick über die niederländisch-deutschen Beziehungen in diesem Jh [Schriften der deutschen Akademie in München. H. 27.]. *München*: Reinhardt, 1937. 64 pp. M. 220

Uhl, Lotte.—Alberus und die Musik. Eine volkskundliche Untersuchung Diss. *Giessen*. [Giessener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie. 47] *Giessen*: von Munchow, 1937 79 pp. M. 320.

Vogt, Paul.—Goethes Lebensanschauung als Erlebnis der heutigen Zeit. *Berlin*: Verlag für Kultur u. Wissenschaft [1937]. 123 pp. M. 3 50

Vogtherr, Kurt.—Die Geschichte des Wortes "deutsch" von Luther bis zur Aufklärung. Diss. Berlin. Teildruck *Weimar*: Bohlau, 1937 55 pp.

Walther, Hans.—Stilkritische Untersuchungen über Hugo von Montfort Diss. *Marburg*: Bauer, 1936. 59 pp.

Weber, Otfried.—Peter Suchenwirt. Studien über sein Wesen und Werk. Diss. *München* [Deutsches Werden H. 11] *Greifswald*: Bamberg, 1937. 189 pp. M. 4 80.

Wenzel, Max.—Anton Gunther, der Sanger des Erzgebirges. Sein Leben u. sein Werk Hrg. vom Landesverein Sachs Heimatschutz und vom Erzgebirgsverein. *Dresden*: 1937. 27 pp. M. 1.

White, Emilie M.—Ein Ausflug in die deutsche Sprache Anfangsschritte *Garden City, N. Y.*: Doubleday, Doran & Co [1937]. xx, 247 pp. \$1.60.

—Ein Ausflug in die deutsche Sprache. Fortschritte. *Garden City, N. Y.*: Doubleday, Doran & Co [1937]. xii, 276 pp. \$1 60

Wiechert, Ernst.—Der Dichter und die Jugend. *Mainz-Kastel*: H. Marxen, 1937. 12 leaves. M. 250.

Wiedemann, Alfred.—Die Flurnamen von Bruchsal. [Badische Flurnamen. Bd 2, Hft 1]. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1937 68 pp. M. 4.

Wielands Gesammelte Schriften Herausgegeben von der Deutschen Kommission der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Erste Abteilung. Werke Sechster Band Agathon Herausgegeben von Wilhelm Kurrelmeyer. 514 pp. — Achter Band, Zweiter Teil, Berichte der Herausgeber zum sechsten bis achten Band. 1. Heft, Bericht und Register zum sechsten Band Agathon von

Wilhelm Kurrelmeyer. 272 pp. *Berlin*: Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1937.

Wildhaber, Arno.—Das Bild der Reformation in der jungdeutschen Epoche. Diss. *Bern*: 1936. viii, 227 pp.

Xylander, Oskar von.—Heinrich von Kleist und J. J. Rousseau. Diss. *München*. [Germanistische Studien H 193]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1937. 389 pp. M. 16.20.

Zenker, Eva-Maria.—Ricarda Huch's lyrische Dichtung. Diss. *Breslau*: Nischkowsky, 1937. 93 pp.

Zimmermann, Alice.—Die schweizerische Demokratie in den Werken Jeremias Gottfrieds und Gottfried Kellers. Diss. *Basel*: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1937. 55 pp. M. 1.50

FRENCH

Adam, Ch.—Descartes, sa vie, son œuvre *Paris*. Boivin, 1937. 180 pp. Fr. 12.

Alain.—Avec Balzac. *Paris*: Gallimard, 1937. 201 pp. Fr. 15

Balzac.—La Cousine Bette, éd. M. Allem. *Paris*: Garnier, 1937. xxxii + 500 pp. Fr. 9

Barbusse, H.—Lettres à sa femme, 1914-17. *Paris*: Flammarion, 1937. 261 pp. Fr. 15.

Barrière, P.—Les rimes de P. de Laval. *Paris*: Delmas, 1937. 174 pp. Fr. 35.

Becker, Ph. A.—Von den Erzählern neben u. nach Chrestien de Troyes. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1937. 181 pp.

Bendz, E.—Paul Valéry et l'art de la prose. *Göteborg*: Guimpert, 1937.

Beuchat, Ch.—Paul de Saint-Victor. *Paris*: Perrin, 1937. Fr. 15.

Boyé, M.-P.—Esquisses romantiques (Latouche, Karr, etc.). *Paris*: Debrasse, 1937. 84 pp. Fr. 10.

Brunschvicg.—Descartes. *Paris*: Rieder, 1937. 97 pp. Fr. 25.

Clayton, Vista.—The Prose Poem in Fr. Lit. of the Eighteenth Century. *New York*: Inst. of Fr. Studies, 1936. Pp. xi + 248. \$3.00

Doon de Mayence, 1^{re} partie, éd. J. Maublère. *Paris*: Lanore, 1937. 167 pp. Fr. 12.

Dréano, M.—La pensée relig. de Montaigne. *Paris*: Beauchesne, 1936. 501 pp. Fr. 55.

Dubberke, I.—Die Sprache des Livre Noir u. der Etablissements von Dax. *Leipzig*: Gronau, 1937. xi + 86 pp.

Duhamel, G.—Textes choisis, éd. J. Bernès *Paris*: Grasset, 1937. 351 pp. Fr. 27.

Escholer, R.—Henri Matisse. *Paris*: Floury, 1937. 185 pp. Fr. 20.

Fabureau, H.—Paul Valéry. *Paris*: Nouv. Rev. crit., 1937. 254 pp. Fr. 15.

Fischer, Hildeg.—Antoine Furetière. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1937. xxix + 333 pp.

Foerster, Ilse.—Marin Cureau de la Chambre (1594-1675). *Breslau*: Priebatsch, 1937. viii + 291 pp.

Geleerd, Sara.—Les traductions hollandaises de Racine au 17^e et au 18^e s. Diss. *Amsterdam*, 1937. iii + 147 pp.

Guyot, Ch.—De Rousseau à Mirabeau. *Paris*: Attinger, 1936. 208 pp. Fr. 20.

Haedicke, W.—Sénancour u. seine geistesgeschichtl. Stellung in d. franz. Lit. Greifswald diss., 1937. 69 pp.

Hartwig, Dora.—Der Wortschatz der Plastik im französischen Mittelalter. Diss. *Berlin*: 1936. 93 pp.

Heilmann, E.—C. P. Duclos, ein Literat des 18. Jhr. und seine Beziehungen zu Rousseau, d'Alembert, Marmontel und anderen Diss. *Berlin*: 1936. 51 pp.

Hering, Werner.—Die Mundart von Bozel (Savoyen). Diss. *Leipzig*: 1936. xvi + 113 pp.

Hitz, M. F.—Die Redekunst in Bourdaloues Predigt. Diss. *München*: 1936. 139 pp.

Kaiser, Paula.—Lamartine und die Musik. Diss. *München*: 1936. 56 pp.

Lachèvre, F.—Mme de Villeroy ou Héloïse de Vivonne Réponse à M. J. Lavaud. Une critique littéraire à trois têtes: P. de Ninon, J. Tournemille, G. Mongrédien. 1937. 16 pp.

—M. Antoine Adam et Théophile, auteur de Francion? Avec la réfutation de sa thèse. *Paris*: Clavreuil, 1937. 35 pp. Fr. 6.

Linze, G.—Dictionnaire fr. *Liège*: Gor-dinne, 1936. 704 pp.

Margenbourg, E.—Charles Péguy. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1937. 81 pp.

Marsan, Jules.—Autour du Romantisme. *Paris*: Eds. de l'Archer, 1937. xxxi + 317 pp. Fr. 50.

Marthold, de, E.—Fr. Villon. *Rome*: Soc. ed. di Novissima, 1937. 109 pp.

Michels, Magda.—Der Stil Chateaubriands. *Bochum-Langendreer*: Poppinghaus, 1937. iii + 114 pp.

Miège, Madeleine.—Le Français dialectal de Lyon *Lyons*: P. Masson, 1937. xii + 123 pp. Fr. 25.

Mignot, H.—Notre langue. *Paris*: Bourrel, 1937. 288 pp. Fr. 11.

Müller, Hans.—Das schmuckende Beiwort im französischen Volkshed. Diss. *Halle*: 1936. xii + 131 pp.

O'Brien, J.—The Novel of Adolescence in France *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1937. viii + 240 pp. \$2.50

Pagès, A.—La Poésie fr. en Catalogne du XIII^e s. à la fin du XV^e. *Paris*: Didier, 1936. xii + 392 pp. Fr. 50.

Pantke, A.—G. Flauberts Tentation de S. Antoine, ein Vergleich der drei Fassungen. Diss. *Leipzig*: 1936. 151 pp.

Pesante, A.—Federico Mistral e la Pleiade provenzale *Udine*: Ist. delle Ediz. Accademiche, 1937.

Peter, R.—Vie secrète de l'Académie fr. Troisième période. *Paris*: Libr. des Champs-Élysées, 1937. 253 pp. Fr. 13.50.

Picard, G.—Nicolas Boileau ou la Révolution dans l'ordre. *Paris*: La Caravelle, 1937. 31 pp. Fr. 3.

Rabelais.—Gargantua, éd. L. Perceau. *Dijon*: Pasquinelly, 1937. 173 pp. Fr. 70.

Rohl, Gerhard.—Die idyllisch-landlichen Motive in der altfranzösischen Literatur. Diss. *Rostock*: 1936. 67 pp.

Ruggieri, R. M.—Il processo di Gano nella "Chanson de Roland." *Florence*: Sansoni, 1937. 213 pp.

Sacher, H.—Die Melodramatik u. das romantische Drama in Frankreich. *Breslau* diss., 1937. 83 pp.

Sachs, Maurice.—A. Gide. *Paris*: Denoël et Steele, 1936. 125 pp. Fr. 6.

Seillière, E.—Paul Bourget, psychologue et sociologue. *Paris*: Nouv. Rev. crit., 1937. 258 pp. Fr. 15.

Snyckers, A.—Duden français, dict illustré de la langue fr. *Leipzig*: Bibliographisches Inst., 1937. 795 pp. \$1.80.

Streeter, H. W.—The 18th-century English novel in Fr. trans. *New York*: Inst. of Fr. Studies, 1936.

Strobel, H.—Die von Pflanzennamen abgeleiteten Ortsnamen einiger sudfrz. Départements *Tübingen* diss., 1937. 102 pp.

Telle, Emile V.—L'œuvre de Marguerite d'Angoulême et la querelle des femmes. Diss. *Toulouse*: Lion et fils, 1937. 416 pp. Fr. 50.

Tielrooy, J.—En groot romanticus. Chateaubriand. *Haarlem*: Tjeenk Willink en Zn., 1937.

Varnum, Fanny.—Un philosophe cosmopolite du XVIII^e s., le chevalier de Chastellux. Diss. *Paris*: Rodstein, 1936. 269 pp.

Wencélius, L.—Calvin et Rembrandt. Diss. *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1937. 239 pp.

—L'Esthétique de Calvin. Diss. *Ibid.*, 1937. 428 pp.

Wenger, J.—The Province and the Provinces in the works of H. de Balzac. *Princeton* diss., 1937. viii + 125 pp.

Wicke, Berta.—Stilprobleme bei Stendhal. *Zürich* diss., 1937. 66 pp.

ITALIAN

Alfieri, V.—Bruto primo. Con introduzione e note di Raffaella Chiantera. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1937. Pp. xvi + 69 con una tavola. L. 6.

Alfieri, V.—Saul. Prefazione di Arturo Farinelli. Nota introduttiva e commento di M. L. Lotti *Torino*: Paravia, 1936. Pp. xlii + 92, con due tavole. L. 4.

—Vittorio Alfieri. Antologia a cura di Tiziano Ascari. *Torino*: Paravia, 1937. 106 pp. L. 5.

Alghieri, Dante.—La Divina Commedia. Col commento di Carlo Grabher. Vol. III. Paradiso. *Firenze*: La Nuova Italia, 1936. 426 pp. L. 10.

—La Divina Commedia e le immagini di Amos Nattini [Paradiso, Cantì I, II, III, IV.] *Milano*: Istituto nazionale Dantesco [1936]. Fol. p. nn. 48 con quattro tavole

—La Vita Nuova. Con introduzione e commento a cura di Daniele Mattalia. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia, 1936. Pp. xxviii + 104 con cinque tavole. L. 4.50.

—Rimario de la Divina Commedia di D. A. e indice alfabetico *Torino*: Soc. ed. Internazionale, 1937. 276 pp con una tavola L. 8.

Arcari, Paolo.—La letteratura italiana e i disfattisti suoi *Milano*: Colonello, 1937. 404 pp. L. 15.

Arnosto, Ludovico.—Arnosto minore. Pagine scelte e commentate da Gaetano Trombatore. *Firenze*: La Nuova Italia, 1936. 123 pp. L. 6.

—Orlando Furioso. Con introduzione e note di Giuseppe Lapparini. *Milano*: Signorelli, 1937. 843 pp. L. 15.

Arrighi, P.—La poésie vériste en Italie. *Paris*: Boivin, 1937. 284 pp.

—Le vérisme dans la prose narrative italienne. *Paris*: Boivin, 1937. 602 pp.

Berchet, Gio.—Romanze e fantasia. Intro. e note di Luigi De Filippo. *Lanciano*: Carabba, 1937. 152 pp. L. 6.

Bigongiari, P.—L'elaborazione della lirica leopardiana. *Firenze*: Le Monnier, 1937. 83 pp. L. 12.

Boccaccio, Giovanni.—Dal Decameron e dalle opere minori. Pagine scelte e commentate a cura di Natalino Sapegno. *Firenze*: La Nuova Italia, 1937. 268 pp. L. 9.

—Novelle e opere minori. Scelte e commentate da G. A. Levi. *Torino*: Soc. ed. Internazionale, 1937. Pp. xii + 320. L. 10

Bonaventura, Arnaldo.—Nozioni di storia della musica in rapporto alla letteratura. *Livorno*: Giusti, 1937. Pp. vi + 95. L. 4.50.

Brossa, Baldassare.—Spiriti e forme della tragedia alfieriana. Prolegomeni. *Torino*: Soc. ed. Internazionale, 1937. 147 pp. L. 7.

Calderaro, Giulia.—Alessandro Manzoni e il mondo latino e greco. *Firenze*: "La Nuova Italia," 1937. 239 pp. L. 12.

Carducci, Giosuè.—Studi su Giuseppe Parini. Il Parini minore. *Bologna*: Za-

nicelli (*Opere di G. U. Ediz Naz*, vol. xvi), 1937 450 pp.

Castelli, A.—Il dissidio interiore di Fr Petrarca. *Roma*: Signorelli, 71 pp.

Copelli, Agostino.—Ugo Foscolo (Vita ed opere). *Bologna*: Cappelli, 1937 87 pp L. 2 25.

Cozzani, E.—*Pascoli*. Vol. II. *Milano*: "L'Eroica," 1937 283 pp. L. 10

Damiani, E.—Il senso del teatro pirandelliano. *Roma*: Rivista italobulgara. 59 pp.

Dazzi, M.—Disegno di una storia della letteratura veneziana *Firenze*: La Nuova Italia, 1937. 16 pp L. 5.

De Sanctis, Fr.—Lettere dall'esilio (1850-1860) A cura di B. Croce. *Bari*: Laterza, 1937 380 pp. L. 30

Dolci, G.—*Carducci* *Milano*: A. F. S., 1937. 126 pp L. 5.

Equini, Adolfo.—Poeti e prosatori d'Italia Appendice al volume I. Scritti latini di Dante, di G. Pontano, del Poliziano, di

Leopardi, Giacomo.—*Opere*. A cura di Giuseppe de Robertis Vol I *Canti Operette morali Martirio de' Santi Padri. Volgarizzamenti Pensieri. Paralipomeni della batracomiomachia*. Con 16 illustrazioni *Milano*: Rizzoli (Classici Rizzoli), 1937. 842 pp. con tredici tavole.

—Prose. *Pensieri, volgarizzamenti, operette morali*. Con note ed a cura di E. Fabietti *Milano*: Barion, 1937. 430 pp. L. 3.

—I *Canti*, seguiti dai *Paralipomeni della Batracomiomachia*. Con pref e commento a cura di E. Fabietti *Milano*: Barion, 1937. 360 pp. L. 3.

—Zibaldone di pensieri. A cura di F. Flora. Vol. I. *Milano*: Mondadori, 1937. 1632 pp. L. 75.

Machiavelli, Niccolò.—Il principe. Introduzione e note di Manfredo Vanni. Aggiuntivi i giudizi più notevoli della critica moderna. *Milano*: Signorelli, 1936. 151 pp. L. 4